FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 126 *1 July 1985*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Arbatov Warns That SDI 'Playing With Fire' AA 1
[PRAVDA 1 Jul]
Beglov on W. Europe's 'Serious Misgivings' on SDI AA 4
Japan's Cooperation With U.S. Points to SDI Role AA 5
Bush Meets USSR Geneva Arms Talks Representatives AA 6
Bush Holds Talks at NATO Headquarters on SDI AA 7
[Zholkver]
Bovin Views Bush's Task in West Europe AA 7
'Good Reason' for Dutch Concern During Bush Trip AA 8
[Olin]
Druzhnin on 'Distortion' of Gorbachev Speech AA 9
State Department: USSR View of Talks Distorted AA 10
[Chernyshev]

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Communique Issued on CEMA Session in Warsaw BB 1
[PRAVDA 29 Jun]
East European Reportage BB 6
[cross-reference]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'Studio 9' Discusses U.S.-USSR Parity, Arms Talks CC 1
[Zorin, Chervov, Shishlin]
UN Anniversary CC 1
U.S. Seeks Military Superiority CC 1
U.S. Plans for 'Star Wars' CC 2
Political Implications of Plans CC 3
USSR-PRC Relations CC 4
U.S.-NATO Relations CC 4
U.S.-Soviet Parity CC 5
Economic Balance CC 7
U.S. Claims of USSR Violations CC 7
U.S. 'Violations' Noted CC 8
Geneva Talks CC 9
Regional Conflicts CC 9
Change in U.S. Policy CC 11
Soviet Policy CC 11
PRC, U.S. Media Reaction to Gorbachev Speech Noted CC 12
[PRAVDA 28 Jun]
Academics Debate 'Civilized' East-West Ties CC 13
[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 26 Jun]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Weinberger Approves AMRAAM Missile Program [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jun] A 1
Pentagon Awards Contracts for 'Space Arms' Radar A 1
House Vote on Intervention in Nicaragua Analyzed [Fesunenko] A 1
SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Profiles U.S. Senator Lugar [Trifonov, 25 Jun] A 3
LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Hits USIA Expansion Plans [26 Jun] A 5
U.S. Plans for Satellite TV Beams to USSR Scored [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 26 Jun] A 7
U.S. 'Militarization' of Canada Denounced [Nikitin in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Jun] A 8
U.S. Military Policy in Northern Europe Viewed [Kononov in IZVESTIYA 15 Jun] A 10

CHINA

PRC Army Reorganization Measures Reported [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jun] B 1
Briefs: Chinese Visit to Kiev B 1

NORTHEAST ASIA

Joint Korean Economic Committee To Be Formed [PRAVDA 21 Jun] C 1
Olympic Sports Delegations Hold Talks in DPRK C 1

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Le Duan Meets With Gorbachev, Statement Issued E 1
PRAVDA Reports Talks [29 Jun] E 1
Private Meeting Noted [VNA] E 3
Dinner Held E 3
Gorbachev Dinner Speech E 4
Le Duan Dinner Speech Report E 7
Lomeyko News Conference E 8
Le Duan Awards Tikhonov [VNA] E 9
Joint Declaration Signed E 10
USSR-SRV Joint Declaration [PRAVDA 30 Jun] E 10
Le Duan 29 June Activities E 16
Le Duan Lays Wreath E 16
Lays Foundation Stone E 16
Departs for Volgograd E 18
Returns to Moscow E 19
Calls on SRV Embassy [Hanoi] E 19
Farewell Ceremony E 20

EASTERN EUROPE

Baybakov Meets With Poland's Jaruzelski, Gorywoda F 1
Hungarian Assembly Reelects Losonczi, Lazar, Sarlos F 1
Bulgarian CP Delegation Visits USSR 10-14 June F 1
[PRAVDA 16 Jun]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Romanov Out; Shevardnadze Full Politburo Member R 1
Politburo Discusses New Program, Syrians' Visit R 1
Supreme Soviet Session Scheduled for 2 July R 2
Gorbachev Greets Opening of Moscow Film Festival R 2
Leaders Attend UN Anniversary Reception R 3
Ukraine CP Leaders Discuss Scientific Progress R 3
[Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAINA 19 Jun]
Dolgikh Addresseses Media Group on Fuel Supplies R 4

ARBATOV WARNS THAT SDI 'PLAYING WITH FIRE'

PM301740 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 85 First Edition p 6

[Article by Academician G. Arbatov: "Playing With Fire"; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] The report that the U.S. Congress had earmarked vast appropriations for "research" on the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" program (commonly known as "star wars") went almost unnoticed over there, clearly because efforts have long been made to accustom both American parliamentarians and the public to the idea of this program. As always, a great many lies were told in the process and it has to be admitted that the lies were sometimes clever. Thus it was that this action slipped through Congress almost without debate. Yet, from the viewpoint of the arms race and the threat of war this may be the most dangerous action for many years...

It has long been clear to people who follow U.S. policy that the Reagan administration has adopted a course of eliminating the system [rezhim] established by the agreements and treaties signed on arms limitation and of wrecking talks on these most important questions. At first, during the 1980 election campaign and the first year of Reagan's rule, Washington generally spoke openly of this. The treaties with the USSR, especially the SALT II treaty, were declared to run counter to U.S. interests (the President himself called this treaty "fatally flawed"). The Republican leadership said it was ready to resume talks with the USSR only once it was able to dictate its will to the Soviet Union, having built up armaments and secured military superiority. However, running up against serious opposition to this line inside the country and among the allies, the administration declared that it would comply with the treaties signed earlier and agreed to start talks afresh with the USSR. But subsequent events have shown that the aim has remained the same and that it was rather a question of a maneuver, of a new tactic whereby treaty pledges are eliminated by removing thin slices of them -- just like slicing a sausage. Talks are held for the purpose of never reaching agreement.

At the same time the Reagan administration has also taken a big step backward on the question of attitudes to nuclear war. Despite previous solemn declarations and even treaty pledges by the United States, Washington has focused its efforts on attempts to leap out of the nuclear stalemate by returning somehow to a situation in which war can be waged with impunity in the expectation of victory. Once again, at first this was said openly. I am referring to the Republican Party's 1980 election platform, numerous statements by Defense Secretary Weinberger and his subordinates and by other administration staffers, and also official documents such as the "1984-1988 Defense Guidance." What runs through these is the idea that the United States must regain the capability to win a nuclear war. One of the scenarios was a "limited" nuclear war in Europe, plans for which were openly discussed in the early eighties. Then, having again run up against growing concern in the United States and the allied countries, they moderated their rhetoric. The policy, however, remained the same. The United States has not abandoned a single military program designed to recover for the United States the opportunity to fight without risking suicide -- in other words, to acquire what strategic jargon calls a "first strike capability."

The "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) embodies both these schemes particularly fully. It is designed to serve on the one hand as the main instrument for wrecking the entire arms limitation process, and on the other as a means of gaining a "first strike" capability (in combination, of course, with other weapons systems -- missiles that are being developed for a preemptive strike against the Soviet Union's strategic retaliatory forces and command and communications centers).

Of course, all this is being hushed up or concealed. By contrast, the U.S. President is presenting the "star wars" project to the public as weapons that will end the nuclear threat and bring mankind to [a time of] universal plenty (as he himself put it, it is a question of weapons that will make it possible to "renounce a future that depends to such a considerable extent on the possibility of rapid and massive nuclear retaliation and to switch to greater emphasis on defensive systems that threaten no one"). In other words, the promise that is made to Americans and not just to Americans but to all mankind is that the problem of security will be solved at last, solved by means of new technology. Against those who doubt the possibility of doing this the U.S. Government has leveled criticism, declaring that "the history of the development of technology convincingly refutes the unsubstantiated claim that anything is technically impossible."

The incantations have scarcely made this whole fantastic idea any more convincing. First of all, the claim that there is a technological solution to any problem is incorrect. It is incorrect even for problems of a technical nature. For instance, it is fundamentally impossible to create a perpetual motion machine, to overcome the operation of physical laws, or to give man physiological immortality.

What President Reagan is promising to bring about by the "star wars" program is just as fundamentally inconceivable. It is, of course, possible to imagine that with the aid of new types of weapons -- mysterious rays, supersupercomputers, and so forth -- in time (even the enthusiasts are promising to do this no earlier than in a few decades) it will be possible to create a system that will be able to down the missiles that currently exist. But by that time will missiles be like those "that currently exist"? The U.S. President has ignored a perfectly self-evident truth: The same human brain, the same research capacities, the same instruments that are employed to create "defensive" weapons will simultaneously work on weapons designed to destroy those "defensive" weapons, to overcome or evade them, or even to find something new against which they are powerless. In this sense the absolute weapons promised by the President cannot exist -- technical progress, science, and technology really cannot be stopped.

If technology cannot ensure security, it is not because it is weak but because the problem of security is essentially not a technical but a political problem. There is no need once again to launch a colossal military program in order to prove this. This has already been proved. After all, the ordinary machinegun was once declared to be the weapon to "end war." Then Dr Teller, who is now a worshiper of "star wars," advertised the thermonuclear bomb as the instrument of "perpetual peace." In short, history has answered the ingenuous question with which attempts are made to mislead uninformed people: If it works, why not give it a try?

However, the infeasiblity of the project in the form in which they are trying to "sell" it to American legislators and also to the American public and the U.S. allies does not make it any less dangerous, and dangerous not at some time in the future, but right now, at the stage that is hypocritically described as "research." In fact, it is a question by no means only of research, nor even only of studies and tests of new weapon systems, but of a new round of the arms race that may be unprecedented in its scope and dangerousness.

For instance, take the scale of this "research" -- 70 billion dollars in 8 years are earmarked for it. That is almost five "Manhattan Projects" (at today's prices) or more than two Apollo projects. Yet until now the programs for creating atomic weapons and putting a man on the moon held the record for expenditure.

In fact what lies behind what is called "research and development" is plans for an unprecedented mobilization of funds, scientific potential, and all conceivable resources for a qualitative new spurt in military technology.

A spurt in all spheres: defensive and offensive armaments, nuclear and conventional, space, beam, and kinetic weapons, and any other types. A spurt toward new, unknown dangers that will greatly surpass the dangers of military nuclear technology, although mankind has still not been able to cope with those. Is the world community prepared for such a leap into the unknown, into dangers, into uncertainty? Does it want it? No one has yet asked that question, and the problem has still practically not even been discussed on that level.

What is more, the essence of this problem is concealed in every possible way, and attempts are made to reduce it to something far safer and simpler. Why not try to get rid of the nuclear threat by means of new defensive weapons? Let's just study this problem, then decide what to do.

But "then" it will be too late to decide anything, too late for a whole series of reasons. One of them is that, in addition to the $70 billion, a huge political price will also have to be paid for the program of what is described as "research," just "along the way," so to speak. One of the first victims of this program would most likely be the Soviet-American arms limitation talks. Their objective was defined in January of this year in the accord between A.A. Gromyko and G. Shultz as the prevention of an arms race in space and the ending of it on earth. Now, so Washington declares, the United States, in defiance of that accord, will in all instances conduct work on creating ABM defenses in order, it is claimed, to find out whether or not this system will work. When it does find this out (according to present plans, no earlier than 1993) the decision will be made whether or not to deploy ABM defenses. If it decides to deploy, only then will the time have come for the next decision: Either unilaterally break the ABM treaty or attempt to persuade the Soviet Union to agree to emasculate this treaty insofar as it failed to prevent implementation of the American plans.

That is an astonishing approach! In this case what will the USSR and the United States hold talks about in Geneva for the next 8 years or more? Until the moment when the United States itself decides what to do next depending on the success of work in the sphere of military technology. When the question is formulated in that way, space weapons are not subject to discussion at all for the next few years. If that is so, then there is no point in discussing armaments on earth either. After all, in the late sixties and early seventies the USSR and the United States reached the unanimous conclusion that the limitation, still less the reduction, of offensive armaments is impossible without the limitation of defensive armaments. The "star wars" project does not revoke this inexorable strategic logic in the slightest. Thus, the conclusion that suggests itself is that the United States is not even planning to seriously hold talks over the next 8 or more years and regards them more as a propaganda ploy, as an instrument -- forgive me for the unceremonious expression -- for universal swindling. I assume that this is what Washington wants, but do people there think that the Soviet Union too will take part in these unworthy and dangerous games? The Soviet viewpoint on this question was expressed quite clearly the other day by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev: If the United States continues merely to temporize, this will force us to reassess the whole situation.

What has been said makes it possible to draw the conclusion that "star wars" is a destructive mine planted beneath the entire process of arms limitation and reduction, destructive even at the present stage of work on the project. Another conclusion is that "star wars" is a mighty generator of the arms race that destabilizes the military-political situation in the world, for all the untenability and infeasibility of the very idea of creating an "impenetrable shield." The whole point is that even rather imperfect ABM defenses of U.S. territory can be a component of what is conceived as a

"first strike" arsenal, especially as the start of work on the new ABM system is being accompanied by the further buildup of efforts to create many types of offensive systems -- the MX, the Midgetman, the Trident II, the B1-B, Stealth, and others -- to say nothing of the fact that it is being accompanied by the further deployment in Europe of American Pershing II missiles, which are intended as a "decapitating" weapon, that is, for a strike against the other side's control and communication centers. Under these conditions the calculation can be based on the assumption that even an imperfect system of defenses will be able to cope with the small part of the other side's retaliatory forces left after the first, "disarming" strike, thereby giving the aggressor a free hand. That is why the nuclear threat will not disappear but will increase with the start of work on the SDI.

So far as President Reagan himself is concerned, "star wars" may indeed, as it is said, be an article of faith, of a thoughtless and fanatical faith that knows no doubts. Even among his close entourage, which unreservedly supports the SDI, there is only a handful of believers, so far as can be judged. The pragmatic calculations of the rest have nothing to do with what the President is promising. These calculations, it seems to me, are as follows.

The present administration represents an extremely conservative part of the U.S. political spectrum and is very strongly influenced by extremist circles and the military-industrial complex, of which the White House incumbent is the stooge. Among the President's entourage, among people who share these extreme views, there are certainly many who realize that the right-wing wave, and still more so the extremist wave, cannot be long-lived. So conscious attempts to consolidate the policy of the extreme right-wingers, to foist it on the country for many years, and thereby to foist it both on Reagan's successors, and, I would add, on the American allies are now increasingly clear in both domestic and foreign policy in the United States. People in Washington are in a frantic hurry precisely because they are trying even under the present administration to make a very dangerous new round of the arms race irreversible -- by virtue of the momentum of the systems that are being set in motion and the creation around them of significant economic and political pressure groups with mercenary interests.

I do not know whether elderly American politicians who now have nothing to lose and younger ones who, never having seen real misfortune, still less war, are accustomed to play at it and have made themselves a career out of this reflect on the threat that this poses to peace, but I am sure of one thing -- that these sorry pastimes may lead to the death of all mankind and that this is real playing with fire.

BEGLOV ON W. EUROPE'S 'SERIOUS MISGIVINGS' ON SDI

LD301008 Moscow World Service in English 0616 GMT 30 Jun 85

[From "News and Views" program]

[Text] Next we have notes by political observer of the NOVOSTI press agency, Spartak Beglov:

One can understand those West European policymakers who, during meetings and conversations with a high-ranking guest from across the Atlantic, U.S. Vice President George Bush, again failed to show enthusiasm about the notorious Strategic Defense Initiative of President Reagan.

In Western Europe the plan has caused much hard thinking. This time too, the American visitor had to look into serious misgivings of the U.S. partners in NATO over the "star wars" program that causes a menace of further grave destabilization of East-West relations.

Even during his initial conversations in Rome the White House emissary was told about the great hopes the West Europeans were pinning on Soviet-American talks in Geneva and in particular on securing a gradual and balanced reduction in the level of armaments.

As it entered these talks, the Soviet Union showed clearly its determination to steadily work towards this aim alone, but as one wonders, how is it possible to count on reciprocity from the American side when actually from the first few days of the Geneva talks Washington began to block consideration of nonmilitarization of outer space in order to have a free hand in another round of the arms race? In its line to quell the anxiety of the West European partners the U.S. leadership banks on the application of its policy of confrontation against the USSR and other socialist countries. This stake on the confrontation goals of Reaganism as a sort of whip in relations with U.S. partners can be traced with increasing clarity to the "star wars" concept itself, which is the next pretext for undermining an expansion of economic, scientific, and technological ties between Western Europe and the socialist countries. This stake goes so far as to make the West European partners of the United States forget about any alternative. Yet, the alternative does exist, and nothing has cancelled out the beneficial experience of this realization during the period of easier tension.

Moscow and other socialist capitals in Europe keep reminding the West that the positive result of the relaxation of tension between East and West can and must be maintained and multiplied in a linkage with long-term prospects for economic cooperation.

At the recent 40th session of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance in Warsaw a clear-cut pledge was reaffirmed that the nations within the socialist community intend to develop equal relations with the Western states and their economic groupings. In this connection the Council recently advanced a new initiative to start mutually advantageous cooperation with the European Economic Community. The fact that the initiative has been made in the East confirms once again that the socialist countries are consistent and sincere in supporting and developing a line for less tension in the political and economic areas as outlined in Helsinki.

The framework of potential cooperation as the alternative to confrontation is truly unlimited. As the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev emphasized recently, the cooperation could extend to space too, however not for the sake of turning outer space into a source of death and devastation, but for the sake of its peaceful exploration in keeping with the peacable needs of all nations.

JAPAN'S COOPERATION WITH U.S. POINTS TO SDI ROLE

LD292106 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1615 GMT 29 Jun 85

[Text] Early this week, the United States carried out tests on laser-weapons at a near-earth orbit, during the flight of the reusable spaceship Columbia. According to American press reports, they were successful. The test has become another practical step of the American Administration in creating a global and, in the opinion of American imperialists, an impenetrable shield, under cover of which the United States plans to keep both the Soviet Union and other real socialist countries at gunpoint.

Along with the elaboration of other varieties of the strategic armament -- MX and Trident missiles, medium-range missiles, the B-1 bomber which is being handed over today to units of the U.S. Air Force -- the space armaments must, according to Washington's design, create a material basis for delivering an unpunishable strike on the Soviet Union.

This is exactly why talk has been increasing in the United States recently about the possibility of the United States' adopting a new strategic concept by the next decade which would be based on the principle of guaranteed survival -- that is, on the same possibility of inflicting a strike which cannot be retaliated.

Moreover, Reagan's administration is also involving its Far East ally, Japan, in the dangerous "star wars" plans in an increasingly active way. On the other hand, statements are constantly being pronounced in Tokyo that they have ostensibly not elaborated any final position on the issue of participation in the American plans to militarize space. The question is, is it really so? Over to our Tokyo correspondent Pavel Potapov.

[Potapov] Striving to mislead the country's public opinion, the official authorities assert that they will make a decision only after making it sure that the program is of a purely defensive nature. Long before that, however, the green light was given for the participation of Japanese monopolies in the American programs to militarize space. As early as the beginning of last year Tokyo agreed to participate in creation of orbital stations, which are an important element of Reagan's "star wars'" program.

The arms race in space has been transformed here into a race of military and industrial concerns to get orders [word indistinct] on pure profit. As soon as the National Council for Exploration of Space announced its participation in creating an American orbital station, local monopolies plunged into feverish activities. On the spot, the leading electrotechnical concern Hitachi formed a council to be concerned with questions of the space base which is designed to wring out profitable government orders for supplies of equipment and up-to-date technology for the U.S. military space project. Similar organizations have been created by other major monopolies of the country, Mitsubishi and Sumitomo. A special committee, attached to the head of the cabinet, has been created, the task of which is coordination of effort of various government agencies and private concerns.

Moreover, violating the Diet's resolution which prohibits military uses of space research, Tokyo has expressed readiness not only to place all kinds of technology at America's disposal, but also to undertake the elaboration and building of one of the principal elements of the complex, an orbital module.

Recently, delegations of experts from the Pentagon have started to come here on frequent visits to elaborate concrete details of Japan's participation. They display special interest to Japanese research in the sphere of laser technology, microelectronics, and other technical novelties. Tokyo associates its cooperation with Washington in this sphere with hopes of realizing its own military space program. The military agency at present is trying to push through an idea of creating a major spy satellite. A decision has been also taken here to create a powerful carrier rocket.

The course of the ruling circles directed at the participation in American plans of space militarization causes growing concern in the country. The democratic public sees, for good reason, a danger of Japanese involvement in Washington's senseless adventures in the space ambitions of conservatives.

BUSH MEETS GENEVA USSR ARMS TALKS REPRESENTATIVES

LD290947 Moscow TASS in English 0939 GMT 29 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva June 29 TASS -- A meeting between Soviet representatives at the talks with the USA on nuclear and space weapons and U.S. Vice President George Bush was held on June 29 at the request of the American side.

A brief discussion was held in the course of the meeting of the state of affairs at the Soviet-American talks.

BUSH HOLDS TALKS AT NATO HEADQUARTERS ON SDI

LD282127 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 28 Jun 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] In Brussels today, Bush has held talks at NATO Headquarters this time, not with the EEC. At the focus of attention there were questions on the further buildup of arms, and, above all, West European involvement in American plans to produce space weapons. Admittedly, it should be said that not only the broad public but also government circles of the West European countries realize the danger of such plans. It is noteworthy that in none of the capitals Bush has visited -- neither Rome, nor Bussels, nor Bonn -- has anyone risked openly backing Reagan's notorious strategic initiative.

BOVIN VIEWS BUSH'S TASK IN WEST EUROPE

LD302029 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 30 Jun 85

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Aleksandr Bovin]

[Text] The trip around West Europe by U.S. Vice President George Bush continued all this week. His route is Rome, Bonn, The Hague, Brussels, Geneva, Paris, and London. Bush's trip has occurred in difficult conditions. A rise in anti-U.S. moods is being observed in West Europe. Once Kissinger called Europe, and I quote, an old lady, too proud to admit her state of ruin, a lady aristocrat who struts with her ancient coat of arms and still thinks herself to be the center of the universe. In West Europe they think that the present Washington has not moved very far from such an attitude to its West European allies. This strategic initiative of Reagan's has given rise to great arguments and hesitations in West Europe. There is discontent in Europe with U.S economic policy, and hence Bush's task is wherever possible to reassure the West European allies.

It must be said that this trip, the style of this trip is a minimum of official public appearances and a maximum of (?confidential) conversation. There will be one big speech, on Wednesday in London at the International Institute of Strategic Studies. Displaying staggering, for Americans, tact and enviable modesty Bush has noted: I will listen, learn, and consult. The matter here is not only of the personal shyness of Bush, the matter is of the distinctive status of the U.S. vice president, whose job it is not to be at the front of the stage, so to speak, in the blaze of the footlights.

James Reston wrote recently that Bush has learned the lesson of the whale, which consists of the fact that in these waters you will be struck by a harpoon only if you are swimming on the surface. Reston thus concludes that Bush is working in the depths and not striving for laurels of any description. The main theme of Bush's conversations is the Strategic Defense Initiative. It is justly feared in West Europe that the "star wars" program will wreck the talks in Geneva, heighten international tension and accordingly noticeably worsen the strategic situation in West Europe. The Americans, of course, do not like all this because politically they need the support of the allies and then they wish to derive a certain benefit. They are reckoning on deriving this benefit at the expense of the participation by West Europe in the realization of the "star wars" program, and Bush tried to persuade those he talked with of this.

Moreover, he stressed that the United States is not at all insisting on some sort of intergovernmental agreements on the subject, that cooperation and participation on the level of private firms and private concerns is quite sufficient.

Bush even supported the French Eureka project, although in its conception this project has an anti-U.S. tendency. In general, despite all this agitation by Bush, inasmuch as one can judge by the materials that already exists, he was met in a very restrained way. He was unable to remove the fears of West Europeans. The London GUARDIAN has written that Western governments have no desire to see Bush off to Washington with a seal of approval for the "star wars" program.

Events which are well known to you moved the problem of international terrorism to the forefront during Bush's trip, and Bush spoke a lot about this. Of course, for any civilized person, for any civilized country, the people of a country should not reconcile themselves to the raging of terrorism. This is elementary. However, when Americans speak about this there is a fair dose of hypocrisy in their words, for it is precisely their policy which frequently pushes people to these reckless, desperate actions which are accompanied by great human loss of life. It is evidently no accident that 40 percent of all terrorist acts are carried out in relation to citizens of the United States and their property. In order to eradicate terrorism it is necessary to destroy the soil in which it flourishes, which feeds it. Unfortunately, the Americans themselves hoe and fertilize this soil.

A final point on the subject of Bush's visit. Reston rightly wrote that Bush is operating in the depths. As for laurels, Bush is looking far ahead. He is already thinking about the next presidential elections and this present trip may entirely be viewed as a laying of the foundations for the future election campaign.

'GOOD REASON' FOR DUTCH CONCERN DURING BUSH TRIP

LD271949 Moscow World Service in English 1710 GMT 27 Jun 85

[Excerpts] In our commentary Viktor Olin looks at the visit to the Netherlands by U.S. Vice President George Bush, who is currently touring Western Europe.

The visit to the Netherlands would deserve no special attention if the vice president has not put aside the main topic of his current tour, so-called international terrorism, and focused on armament [as heard], the reason being that the Netherlands has yet to announce its final decision on the deployment of American cruise missiles with nuclear warheads on its territory. At his meetings with government leaders and members of parliament Mr Bush claimed that the deployment of cruises, the buildup of strategic weapons and the preparations for "star wars" were all necessary if there was to be progress at the Geneva talks with the Soviet Union on nuclear and space weapons. Judging by press reports the vice president failed to win the support hoped for. Members of parliament from the ruling parties told him they did not share his optimism about quick progress at Geneva, and they said that Washington's military programs, including the preparations to put weapons in space, caused serious concern in Western Europe, as destabilizing factors.

This concern has good grounds. When the Soviet Union and the United States decided to open talks in Geneva, they agreed that the purpose of the talks would be to stop the arms race on earth and prevent a race in space, and it was assumed, naturally, that each side would meet the other half-way.

Unfortunately, this has not happened. The United States has assumed an unconstructive position that does anything but promote the aims of the talks. One indication of this is America's refusal to accept a Soviet proposal that would have created favorable conditions for agreement on the whole range of issues. The proposal was to declare a moratorium for the duration of the talks on space weapons, strategic weapons, and medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. The United States has not only rejected this initiative, it has been pushing the deployment of first-strike nuclear missiles to build up its strategic arsenal, and it's been going ahead in creating a space shield as a weapon for "star wars." All this, far from promoting the Geneva talks, means the United States has turned its back on the very purpose of the talks. Washington is clearly trying to use the negotiations with the Soviet Union as a screen for stepped-up military programs. The Dutch had good reason to voice concern during the visit of Vice President George Bush.

DRUZHNIN ON 'DISTORTION' OF GORBACHEV SPEECH

LD272235 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 27 Jun 85

[Text] The speech of Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev delivered in Dnepropetrovsk is in the center of attention of foreign news agencies and press today. Most of the comments on it stress that the Soviet Union has once more displayed its firm determination to put an end to the arms race. There appeared to be, however, some commentators in the West who were trying to misrepresent the position of the Soviet Union by asserting that the Soviet Union is threatening to disrupt the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. Aleksandr Druzhnin, political observer of the All-Union Radio and Central TV comments on this:

Is is difficult to imagine that there can exist a cruder or more unscrupulous distortion of the Soviet position. The fact is, the speech of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev says it clearly -- the Soviet Union is ready to discuss an agreement on not only putting an end to the arms race, but also on their reduction in the largest possible scale, including universal and complete disarmament. The constructive Soviet proposals directed at saving the world from the threat of a military catastrophe prove it to any reasonable person that it is really so. In order to reach this end, the Soviet Union has among other things volunteered to participate in the Geneva talks. Well, and what was the position occupied in Geneva by our counterparts? The Americans have not so far put forward any serious proposal on curtailing the arms race. Moreover, everything points to the fact that curbing this race does not in the least correspond to their intentions. Indeed, how can one seriously strive to prevent the arms race in space -- this is exactly the task posed before the Geneva talks -- and at the same time, sparing neither resources nor great sums of money, to mount up the effort in militarization of space? The United States is planning to spend $500 million on realization of the program to create first strike space weapons which official Washington modestly calls the Strategic Defense Initiative and which was appropriately named the "star wars" program by vast masses of people. There are probably not many native people who would be ready to believe the assurances of the Washington politicians about the subject matter being scientific research in the sphere of the military use of space. The military and industrial complex of the United States has never before invested such colossal sums of money into creation of the most up-to-date weapons, and it will not let the "star wars" program be shelved. Thus, the "star wars" plans create a real danger of a military conflict; they are aimed at changing the military balance in favor of the United States, and at obtaining the military superiority to over socialist countries.

Isn't it clear, therefore, that under such conditions the Soviet Union cannot permit the Geneva talks to be used as a blind for concealing dangerous military preparations? The Soviet Union is ready for carrying out talks in Geneva.

However, the American program to militarize space plays the role of a blank wall standing in the way of reaching an accord. Whether it is going to be removed depends of course on those who erected it, evidently trying to evade constructive and fair talks.

STATE DEPARTMENT: USSR VIEW OF TALKS DISTORTED

LD290756 Moscow TASS in English 0741 GMT 29 Jun 85

["Washington: Hypocrisy and Lack of Constructiveness" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev: Washington did not like the assessment of the American position at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space armaments, made by the Soviet Union. The U.S. State Department, in a fit of irritation, called it "distorted" and expressed its "astonishment." In fact, what really causes astonishment is the State Department's official statement on the issues. The statement totally distorts the real state of affairs, everything in it is put upside down.

It follows from the statement that it is not the United States, but the Soviet Union which fails to comply with the January agreement on the objectives and subject of the talks. It seems that they in the State Department have "mislaid" the joint Soviet-American statement of January 7-8 this year, or think that the world public have forgotten its content and may be easily deluded. It is, probably, counting on this latter that the State Department declares that the USSR "has sought unilaterally to impose preconditions, linking discussion of nuclear arms reductions to prior U.S. agreement to Soviet demands that we (USA -- ed.) abandon research under the Strategic Defense Initiative." So, in the opinion of the State Department, the demand, recorded in the joint statement, that all issues "be considered and resolved in their interrelationship" has now turned into a "unilateral precondition". The U.S. Administration thus shows utter disregard for its own commitments.

In a bid to justify Washington's unconstructive position, the State Department declares that the United States meant "conceptual interrelationship" between offensive and defensive weapons. Hardly anyone, however, can be deluded by a vague phrase of this kind. It is obvious that the interrelationship between strategic and defensive arms is of a paramount objective character and circumventing it may only be directed at disrupting the strategic parity. The United States should better not hope that the Soviet Union will agree to any reductions of its nuclear systems of retaliation at a time when Washington is accelarating its programe of "making obsolete" Soviet nuclear armaments by carrying out the "star wars" programme.

The U.S. Administration was also "offended" by the remark that the programme of space militarisation blocks the way toward agreements in Geneva. The State Department mentions the "constructiveness" and "flexibility" of the U.S. position at Genervа. All this implies the discussion of the American "star wars" programme and "rules" for developing space-based strike weapons. But the January agreement provides for the elaboration of measures for preventing an arms race in outer space. The U.S. position at the talks can aptly be described as open sabotage of the consideration and solution of the issue of preventing the arms race in outer space.

Washington is using all means to push through and legalise its programme of militaristic near-earth space with a view to gaining military strategic superiority. It is high time that Washington drastically reconsiders its position at the Geneva talks and abandons the attempts to use them as a cover for military programmes. If Washington adopted a more sensible stance, the negotiators at Geneva would discuss far-reaching, really radical reductions of nuclear stockpiles by the two sides. Should the American Administration continue its present policy, the Soviet Union will be compelled to reassess the current situation with due account of all its integral elements.

COMMUNIQUE ISSUED ON CEMA SESSION IN WARSAW

PM281814 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jun 85 First Edition pp 1, 4

["Communique on the 40th Sitting of the CEMA Session" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The regular 40th sitting of the CEMA session was held in Warsaw, capital of the Polish People's Republic, 25-27 June 1985.

Taking part in the session's work were delegations headed by G. Filipov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Bulgarian People's Republic; G. Lazar, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People's Republic; To Huu, vice chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers; W. Stoph, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers; C.R. Rodriguez, vice president of the Councils of State and Ministers of the Republic of Cuba; D. Sodnom, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Mongolian People's Republic; W. Jaruzelski, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic; C. Dascalescu, prime minister of the Socialist Republic of Romania; N.A. Tikhonov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; CSSR Premier I. Strougal; and also CEMA Secretary V.V. Sychev and representatives of CEMA organs.

In accordance with the agreement between CEMA and the SFRY Government, an SFRY delegation headed by B. Srebric, vice president of the Federal Executive Council, took part in the session's work.

Representatives of the People's Republic of Angola, the DRA, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the People's Republic of Mozambique, the Republic of Nicaragua, and Socialist Ethiopia were invited to participate in the session as observers.

The sitting was chaired by W. Jaruzelski, head of the Polish People's Republic delegation.

The session noted the great importance of the freedom-loving peoples' victory over Hitlerite fascism and Japanese militarism, the 40th anniversary of which is celebrated this year by the socialist countries and all progressive mankind.

The Soviet Union played a decisive role in the liberation of mankind from fascist slavery. A weighty contribution to victory was made by the other peoples of the anti-Hitler coalition and all participants in the struggle against fascism. The routing of fascism and the victorious conclusion of the war were an event of crucial, world-wide historic significance. Revolutionary processes were accelerated in a whole series of countries. The world socialist system emerged, and the community of socialist countries was formed and is developing. The victory over fascism also accelerated the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism.

Today socialism is a mighty force exerting an enormous influence on mankind's development and is an invincible factor of peace and guarantee of peoples' security.

The session noted with satisfaction that Poland, which suffered the first blow by the Nazi aggressors and was reborn to a new life as an independent socialist country, together with the other CEMA countries is making a fitting contribution to consolidating peace and to cooperation among the fraternal countries and is successfully rebuffing the intrigues of imperialism.

The growing role of economic, scientific, and technical cooperation among the fraternal countries in boosting the efficiency of social production was noted during the examination of progress in the implementation of decisions made at the economic summit conference of CEMA countries (June 1984) and the 38th (extraordinary) CEMA session.

Purposeful work has been launched in the fraternal countries to carry out the conference decisions and implement the agreed on main directions of the long-term strategy for economic development and the deepening of mutual cooperation. This is an important factor in the CEMA countries' further development and the strengthening of their unity and cohesion.

The preparation for and holding of communist and workers party congresses is the main event in the lives of the CEMA countries' peoples last year and this year. Much work is being done in the countries to accelerate socioeconomic developement, enhance the people's labor and political activeness, ensure conditions for raising the population's living standards and improving the national economy's structure, improve all aspects of society's life, develop mutual cooperation, and deepen socialist economic integration.

National income in CEMA countries as a whole rose by 3.6 percent in 1984 compared with 1983, industrial output rose by 4.4 percent, and agricultural output rose by 3 percent. Real per capita incomes rose 2.6 percent. Major housing construction progarms are being implemented and medical services and social security are improving.

The CEMA countries' total foreign trade turnover in 1984 exceeded 313 billion transfer rubles, which is 9.7 percent higher than in 1983. Reciprocal trade developed at a faster pace. In 1984 it increased by 10.6 percent and its share in total trade turnover was about 60 percent.

In accordance with the economic conference decisions, the CEMA countries and the council's organs carry out consistent work to accelerated scientific and technical progress. In connection with the comprehensive program for scientific and technical progress for a 15-20 year period, which is being elaborated, the session drew particular attention to the need to closely coordinate scientific-technical and production cooperation.

As part of the implementation of specific directives by the economic conference regarding the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and cooperation in machine building, the radioelectronic industry, and other sectors was focused on the priority directions defined by the conference. On the basis of large-scale agreements on specialization and production sharing, reciprocal deliveries of machines and equipment, including new technology and electronic products, increased significantly, and cooperation on industrial robots is being organized.

A general agreement on multilateral cooperation in the elaboration and organization of specialized and shared production of flexible production systems for machine building and in their extensive introduction into the national economy was signed during the session's sitting. The creation of highly automated systems of equipment for various types of technological processes in industrial production, transportation, and storage, modular [agregatno-modulnyy] industrial robots, and automated control and design systems, and programming, normative-technical, and cadre support are envisaged. The implementation of the agreement will help further improve the structure and enhance the technical standard of the member-countries' national economies.

The session set CEMA organs, primarily the CEMA Committee for Cooperation in Machine Building, the task of further developing specialization and production sharing, particularly as regards high-quality modern machines and equipment meeting world technical standards.

The fuel, energy, and raw materials base of the national economy of all community countries is being strengthened by mobilizing their own resources and pooling the CEMA countries' efforts, and also through reciprocal deliveries of the relevant products.

Construction work has begun at the Krivoy Rog Ore Enriching Combine for the production of raw material for the metallurgical industry. The construction of the first 1-gigawatt power block at the Khmelnitskaya AES has entered its final phase. The power transmission line from that station to the Polish People's Republic has been built. New power blocks have been commissioned at the South Ukrainian AES, and a 750-kilowatt intersystem power transmission line from that station to the Socialist Republic of Romania and the Bulgarian People's Republic is under construction. New power blocks have been commissioned at nuclear power stations in the Hungarian People's Republic and the CSSR. A program for the construction of nuclear power stations and nuclear heat supply stations in CEMA countries in the period through the year 2000 is being elaborated. Coordination work is in progress on conditions for cooperation to construct a long-distance gas pipeline from Yamburg to the USSR's western border.

The session noted that the CEMA countries are implementing a package of measures to intensify the struggle for the rational consumption of resources. This has made it possible to ensure the development of their economy while reducing somewhat the energy- and materials-intensiveness of production. Nevertheless, considerable reserves still exist here. The importance of expanding exchanges of advanced experience in this sphere and the introduction of such experience into the national economy as an important factor in the intensification of production was emphasized.

To implement the course of saving resources, which was defined by the Moscow summit conference as one of the main directions for solving the fuel and raw materials problem, the session adopted a program for the CEMA countries' cooperation in the saving and rational utilization of material resources through the year 2000. The program includes over 100 cooperation measures envisaging the creation and introduction of energy- and materials-saving machines and equipment, control apparatus, automated systems, advanced economical technologies and materials that are up to world standards, the wider use of secondary resources, production waste, and renewable energy sources, and the replacement of liquid fuel by solid and gas fuels. The first step in implementing the program was the signing of a general agreement on multilateral cooperation in the use of natural gas as a motor fuel for means of transportation during the session's sitting.

The CEMA session examined progress in the coordination of CEMA countries' national economic plans for 1986-90. It was noted that in this work, the economic conference's decisions are consistently fulfilled and economic policy is coordinated in spheres connected with mutual cooperation and, as regards the interested countries, also in other spheres of socioeconomic development, including coordination of capital investments in agreed spheres and projects. For this purpose, the CEMA countries have already signed on a bilateral basis 17 programs for the development of economic, scientific, and technical cooperation through the year 2000. During the multilateral coordination of plans, agreements on specialization and production sharing, joint construction of economic projects, and scientific and technical cooperation are being prepared.

Mutual goods deliveries for the next 5-year plan period have now been largely agreed, and intensive talks are in progress to conclude the coordination of national economic plans. A number of major cooperation projects decided by the CEMA session at its 39th sitting have been worked out. Considerable attention has been paid to assimilating and expanding the production of modern and highly productive machines and equipment and enhancing the technical standards and quality of reciprocally delivered products. It is planned to further increase the production and reciprocal deliveries of many types of machines and equipment whose sale to socialist countries is artifically restricted by the United States and several other capitalist countries.

Following the economic conference line of accelerating the development and enhancing the efficiency of the national economies of the SRV, the Republic of Cuba, and the Mongolian People's Republic and of ensuring their broader participation in the international socialist division of labor, the CEMA countries and primarily the USSR will continue to give these countries economic aid and assistance in the development of individual sectors of the national economy. It was decided to examine the questions of the deepening and improvement of cooperation between European CEMA countries and the SRV, the Republic of Cuba, and the Mongolian People's Republic at a sitting of the CEMA session.

Having examined the work done at the CEMA, the session approved the activity of the Executive Committee and other CEMA organs aimed at consistently implementing the decisions of the economic conference and the 38th (extraordinary) session meeting.

The CEMA countries agreed at the concluding stage of the coordination of their national economic plans in 1986-90 to seek additional potential for developing economic cooperation, above all international specialization and production sharing, increasing mutual trade turnover, and making fuller use of existing production capacities and to envisage mutual commitments for increasing technical standards and the quality of particularly important types of reciprocally delivered items. It was agreed to rapidly complete the work on the preparation for signing of new agreements on economic, scientific, and technical cooperation and on renewing existing ones.

The CEMA session instructed sectorial CEMA organs to hold consultations on questions of further developing sectorial cooperation, including production cooperation, with a view to collaborating on the implementation of the measures being pursued by the countries to intensify and increase the economic efficiency of production and seek reserves for further increasing reciprocal trade turnover in the next 5-year period by formalizing the accords that have been reached into corresponding agreements.

The successful development of CEMA relations with non-CEMA members was noted.

The CEMA's fruitful cooperation with Yugoslavia on the basis of the agreement with the SFRY Government has continued. Considerable results have been achieved in sectors such as machine building, ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy, the power industry, and the metalworking, chemical, electronics, and food industries.

Cooperation has been implemented on the basis of CEMA agreements with Finland, Iraq, and Mexico. The session ratified an agreement on cooperation between CEMA and Mozambique.

Cooperation is developing successfully between the CEMA countries and Nicaragua and also between CEMA and that country on the basis of the agreement signed in 1983.

The session resolutely protested the U.S. Administration's introduction of an economic blockade against Nicaragua that flouts all norms of international law and contravenes the principles of relations among states, and demanded that the interference in the internal affairs of this sovereign country be ended.

The invariability of the CEMA countries' course of persistently deepening and expanding cooperation with developing states both in bilateral relations and on a multilateral basis was reaffirmed. The CEMA countries will continue to aid these states to strengthen their independence and economic development, to strengthen their state and cooperative sectors and planned principles in the national economy, and to create and expand industrial and other projects as well as the agro-industrial complex with a view to solving the food problem, which is one of the most acute problems for most developing states.

Readiness was expressed to expand industrial cooperation with developing countries in the production of finished products, taking account of the sides' interests and capabilities. Active aid will continue to be given to developing countries in training national skilled cadres.

The session stressed that the implementation of the action program put forward by the CEMA countries' economic summit for improving international economic relations, ensuring economic security, and establishing trust in this most important sphere of interstate ties is a weighty contribution to the struggle to restructure these ties on a just and democratic basis and to establish a new international economic order. The implementation of this program demands the pooling of all states' efforts.

The session noted that the development of the economy and mutual cooperation among the CEMA member-countries has taken place under conditions of a serious inflaming of international tension as a result of the pursuit by aggressive circles of imperialism, above all U.S. imperialism, of a course of confrontation, and of their attempts to achieve military superiority. The whipping up of the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, by these circles is the main reason for the deepening of political and economic instability in the world and is intensifying the danger of nuclear war.

The situation of the developed capitalist countries is unstable and crisis-ridden, which is adversely affecting international economic cooperation. The currency and financial crisis has grown deeper and trading contradictions between capitalist countries have become even more exacerbated. The imperialist circles of the United States are making attempts to resolve the contradictions and their own difficulties at the expense of the peoples both of their own country and also of other countries, including their Western partners, and are transferring the burden of this crisis to the developing countries. The offensive against the social rights of the working people is being intensified. The reduction of the population's standard of living is continuing and a high level of unemployment persists.

The sharp growth of military spending and the U.S. federal budget deficit, the artificially high exchange rate of the dollar and of interest rates, above all at U.S. banks, the intensification of protectionism on the part of the imperialist powers, and unequal exchange are disrupting the normal development of world trade and are having a particularly unfavorable impact on the situation of the developing countries.

The egotistical policy of the imperialist powers is making the foreign debt burden of the developing countries, which is a consequence of their inequitable position in the capitalist sector of the world economy, even more intolerable.

The CEMA member-countries support the demands of the developing countries for the restructuring of currency and financial relations in the world capitalist economy on a just and democratic basis, and for the exclusion of any methods of economic coercion and aggression from the practice of international intercourse.

The CEMA member-countries advocate the development of mutually advantageous and nondiscriminatory trade and economic links between socialist and developed capitalist countries, considering that this could successfully promote a healthier development of international economic relations, cooperation, and security.

The council session confirms the proposal for the establishment of relations between CEMA and the EEC.

The socialist community countries consistently issue peaceful initiatives. They resolutely advocate the prevention of the militarization of space. They propose that the arms race, and primarily the nuclear arms race, be ended; that the testing of nuclear weapons be ended and that arsenals of such weapons be frozen without delay so as to embark subsequently on a radical reduction of nuclear weapons and ultimately to eliminate them entirely; that chemical weapons be prohibited and eliminated; that a treaty be concluded on the mutual nonuse of armed force and on the maintenance of peaceful relations between Warsaw Pact and NATO states; and that a practical understanding be reached between them on not increasing military spending and on the subsequent reduction of such spending.

The main obstacle to imperialism's aspirations, which endanger peace and which are aimed at aggravating international tension and undermining normal international economic ties, is the community of socialist countries and their powerful economic and defense potential. The CEMA member-countries, strengthening their unity and cooperation, will continue to take all the necessary steps to defend their vital interests and for the further consolidation of technical and economic independence. The Warsaw Treaty and the foreign policy initiatives of its member -- states have served the cause of preserving peace for 30 years now. The great significance of this organization for the development and consolidation of the comprehensive cooperation of its members was confirmed with regard to the extention of the Warsaw Treaty for the next 20 years with a subsequent extension for a further 10 years. At the same time, there was confirmation of the pact member-states' determination to develop a peaceful dialogue with other states in a spirit of good-will and trust, to establish broad international cooperation in the interests of ensuring universal peace and security, of eliminating the danger of nulcear war, and of ending the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race, on earth and of preventing it in space.

The firm conviction was expressed at the sitting that the measures defined by the session will serve the sucessful fulfillment of the decisions of the CEMA countries' economic summit conference, the further economic and social development of the fraternal countries, the consistent deepening and improvement of their mutual cooperation, and the cause of peace and progress.

The session's sitting took place in an atmosphere of unanimity, fraternal friendship, and complete mutual understanding.

East European Reportage

For East European reportage on the 40th CEMA session held in Warsaw 25-27 June, including speeches by several delegation leaders, see the Intrabloc Affairs section of the 25 June Eastern Europe DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

'STUDIO 9' DISCUSSES U.S.-USSR PARTY, ARMS TALKS

OW290933 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0612 GMT 29 Jun 85

["Studio 9" program, presented by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, Soviet television and radio political observer, with Colonel General Nikolay Fedorovich Chervov, chief of a directorate of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, and political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades. We are meeting with you in Studio 9 of the Ostankino Television Center for our monthly talk devoted to topical problems of world politics. Taking part in today's talk are Col Gen Nikolay Fedorovich Chervov, chief of directorate of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, and political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin.

UN Anniversary

Our talk is taking place during extremely significant days. Exactly 40 years ago, in San Francisco, the representatives of 50 world states signed the Charter of the United Nations Organization, which was being created at that time, defining the main goals of the organization: the basic norms of international affairs. On instructions from the Soviet Government, Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko signed the Charter on behalf of our country.

Establishing the United Nations Organization, the peoples of the world, who had just experienced the bloodiest war mankind had known, pinned considerable hopes on it. Marking the 40th anniversary of the existence of this organization today -- and, in this connection, 1985 has been proclaimed UN Year -- we can note that much has been achieved in past years in the sphere of international cooperation. The very date being marked -- 40 years of the existance of the United Nations Organization -- attests to much: 40 years is a considerable period, and during this period the dangerous plans of the enemies of peace have been, and are being, thwarted.

Our country, the Soviet Union, plays a leading role in this. Here is an example: The Soviet Union has advanced more than 130 proposals, constructive and developed proposals, in this period, just on questions of disarmament and halting the arms race.

At the same time, one has to say that, far from what was thought and planned by the creators of the idea of the unification of nations has been implemented. I think I would not be wrong to say that the reason for this is the policy of the imperialist powers, primarily the United States. Washington's course, dangerous to the cause of peace, particularly worsened at the end of the 1970's and the beginning of the 1980's.

U.S. Seeks Military Superiority

When the Republican administration came to power in Washington, it, strictly speaking, did not conceal its desire to upset the prevailing military and strategic balance, and to tip the scales of military superiority in favor of the United States. Such plans were openly proclaimed at the beginning of the 1980's.

However, time flies. We are now in the middle of the 1980's, and I think that it would be quite appropriate to examine how Washington's plans appear from today's viewpoint, and how one would assess the political-strategic and military-strategic situation in the contemporary world. Let us begin our talk with a reply to this question. I ask you, Nikolay Fedorovich, to begin.

[Chervov] If one talks about the military aspects of the current situation, one should first of all emphasize the unprecedented scale of military preparations by the United States and NATO. The United States has unleashed an unrestrained arms race. It outputting into operation increasingly updated nuclear and conventional arms systems, and spending enormous funds on them.

Why is this being done? There is one goal: the achievement of military superiority. Now, Valentin Sergeyevich, one can indeed observe in the United States a kind of nostalgia for the 1950's, when it had a strategic advantage. However, the world has changed greatly since then. The socialist states have, through common efforts, achieved military-strategic parity with the NATO bloc. The prevailing approximate military balance is a reliable guarantee for the socialist states' security and for strengthening peace on earth.

However, peace under conditions of equality does not suit Washington. Strategic parity is not to the liking of the U.S. leaders. It is difficult for them to acknowledge that today they can talk to us only on equal terms. This leads to their attempt to regain military superiority at all costs. The U.S. and NATO path to military superiority is contained in their military budgets and programs, worked out until the end of this century.

Conducting this course, the United States and NATO have taken the path of direct, forceful pressure on the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. They are striving to change the entire strategic situation in their favor, and blackmail us with the threat of war. With this aim, the United States is creating the potential for a disarming, nuclear first strike. I shall enumerate just the names of weapons systems: the MX ICBM; the strategic missiles Trident I and II; the heavy bombers B-1B and Stealth; Pershing II, and thousands of variously based cruise missiles. All this is first strike potential.

Nuclear war strategy is concealed behind the White House's peaceful rhetoric. The United States is also increasing the potential of conventional armaments, which can be used to strike at Warsaw Pact forces over the entire depth of their deployment. The point here is that the nuclear arms race, begun by the United States, has failed to give it any advantage. You know that the United States has been adopting one strategic program after another. That includes armadas of heavy bombers, missile-carrying submarines, the creation of nuclear charges, with separate, individually targeted warheads, and cruise missiles. Yet none of these arms systems has managed, and will not manage, to improve its own security. On the contrary, because of the Pentagon leaders' shortsightedness, serious damage is being done to the security of the United States as each of these programs, each of the U.S. strategic arms systems, is being countered by a commensurate response by the Soviet Union. In such circumstances, and for these reasons, the United States has chosen space as a new area to obtain an advantage over the socialist countries.

U.S. Plans for 'Star Wars'

White House leaders intoxicate themselves with the dream that, with the aid of "star wars," they will manage to gain a breakthrough in the military aspect, and dictate their will to the Soviet Union. What is being planned in Washington? To create an antimissile shield over the United States, which means to protect U.S. territory with a multitiered antimissile defense and thus deprive the Soviet Union of the possibility of delivering a return strike.

Simultaneously, Washington is planning to increase its nuclear first strike potential by which it means to have an invincible sword among the arms I have mentioned, and additionally deploy new strategic forces, based in space, for the purpose of hitting targets on land, at sea, in the air, and in space.

The final task is to acquire, with the aid of the shield, and of the invincible sword, the capability of delivering a nuclear strike with impunity against the Soviet Union, and thus achieve decisive military superiority over the socialist countries. That is the essence of the U.S. "star wars" plan.

Pentagon leaders' statements to the effect that "star wars" is a kind of defense and that the space arms being developed in the United States are allegedly harmless means is nothing less than political shamanism and deception of the people. Any military specialist knows that the space arms being created can be used both for defensive, and mostly for offensive, purposes. The space arms now being created in Washington are intended, primarily, for offensive use. However hard the United States tries to justify "star wars," the implementation of President Reagan's so-called SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative] will lead to the emergence of space weapons. This means that, in the arms race, humanity will cross the dangerous point from which there may be no return. That is why we persistently propose not to convert space into a new source of military threat, not to create space strike weapons. In this case, it would be possible to radically reduce nuclear arms and gradually proceed to their complete elimination.

As has been repeatedly announced at the highest level, the Soviet Union is not striving for military superiority, either on land or in space. It is doing its utmost to stop the arms race. But, if the preparations for "star wars" continue, then, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has indicated, we shall have no other option than to take countermeasures, including, of course, increasing and perfecting offensive nuclear arms.

This gives rise to the question of whether it will be possible to prevent the deployment of space strike arms and stop the arms race in space. This question is acquiring primary importance. The future development of the military-political situation in the world depends on its solution.

Political Implications of Plans

[Zorin] Nikolay Vladimirovich, now let us look at this problem from a political point of view. Nikolay Fedorovich discussed the military aspect.

[Shishlin] Well, first of all, I would like to agree with Nikolay Fedorovich that there are indeed more weapons, but less security; even the United States has less security. Frankly, the political consequences of this military-strategic parity, and not only of military-strategic parity, but of the development of the world situation during the 1980's, the first half of the 1980's, generally convince one that what was contemplated in the United States, what was planned in Washington, did not turn out.

Let us consider the aims the United States set for itself. First of all, it undoubtedly figured that by building up its arms, by realizing a kind of forceful pressure over the whole sphere of world politics, it would weaken the international position of the world socialist system and put pressure on socialism. It failed to do this. It failed, not only because the socialist countries did not surrender a single position; it failed on the broadest strategic count.

I do not want to simply the picture. Of course, we know that the collisions were complex; the political collisions during the first years of the 1980's were not simple. It is sufficient to single out the dramatic crisis in Poland. Its consequences continue to be felt even today in the Polish People's Republic. Undoubtedly, the main result of the latest developments, the main result of the efforts of the Polish People's Republic, the PZPR, and Poland's allies, is that socialism in Poland was not upset, and thereby the plans of the enemies of socialism, primarily the foes of socialism across the ocean, were ruled out.

It is significant that, throughout this period, the socialist countries have confidently developed in the social and economic sphere, and generally we have taken a new step in our economic development. What may be even more important, very precise conclusions of a strategic nature for the future have been made. I have in mind, primarily, the line that has been delineated for enriching, and augmenting, the cooperation of the socialist states in all directions.

This is not in the realm of wishful thinking; this is in the sphere of real policies and practical steps. These are actions, such as the extension of the term of the Warsaw Pact. Such actions as the recent conference of secretaries of central committees of fraternal parties on economic issues in Moscow, and the work of the 40th session of the CEMA Council, and many others. Of course, these are bold and creative -- I would even say daring -- searches for new answers to new problems which have arisen for us and our friends in the present stage of social development.

In other words, the first thing that should be said in speaking about the political consequences of development over a period of 5 years, say, is that the positions of the socialist world have not been shaken. They have become sounder. I think that it is also quite important that the development of relations between the United States and China has not gone as Washington calculated, far from it, although, of course, the United States has cast a great number of lines into China's political waters.

USSR-PRC Relations

Nevertheless, it is most characteristic that the Americans are watchfully following any, even the most modest, progress in some directions in Soviet-Chinese relations. They are thoroughly assessing all complicating issues in relations between China and the USSR. However, they see that the Chinese view the world, and events in the world, in their own way, and not as Washington politicians would like them to. This makes increasingly nervous those who, in their policies, are oriented to cultivating Soviet-Chinese alienation. This makes increasingly nervous those who see the clear line of our state and our party on normalizing relations with China.

U.S.-NATO Relations

Of course, far from everything is smooth and unclouded in relations between the United States and its partners, including its NATO partners. The United States undoubtedly would like, as a minimum, to monopolize the conduct of affairs in the framework of East-West relations, and interrupt, or emasculate, the dialogue between East and West. This did not happen, and the best proof of this was the interesting talks held over recent months in Moscow.

I have in mind, in particular, the talks with Willy Brandt. I would generally like to point out that interesting and fascinating prospects are opening up in augmenting and enriching cooperation with the socialists and social democrats in those things relating to consolidating peace. I have in mind the talks with Italian Prime Minister Craxi; the entire busy diplomatic calendar outlined for 1985. Of course, I would include the interesting visits of our parliamentary delegations to various countries.

In other words, we can state that, in fact, this is not some sort of uncoordinated series of events simply coming together; we are talking about the emergence of a trend, a positive trend. We are talking about the fact that there is a common interest, both among the socialist and the capitalist states. This interest lies in strengthening peace, in normalizing the international situation, and this truly has prospects.

Of course, talking about the political consequences, to complete the picture, it should be noted that events in Africa, Asia, and Latin America are not developing according to Washington's schemes.

Of course, I am not at all inclined to underestimate the influence of imperialism on this enormous political area. A strong imperialist influence naturally exists there. Still, these countries, which face agonizing problems of development, and are interested in solving these problems, are also vitally interested in a health political climate. There is a basis here for mutual understanding between us, and not only for mutual understanding, but also for developing broad fruitful and peaceful cooperation. The fruitful results of the visit by Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi to the Soviet Union indicate that precisely this is happening.

In short, according to a strategic count, we have the right to assert that U.S. policy, and the precepts adopted during the present U.S. President's first term in the White House are getting nowhere. The policy has indeed become more aggressive, malicious, and harsh, but not more effective.

U.S.-Soviet Parity

[Zorin] Nikolay Fedorovich, I would like to return to one of the circumstances associated with what you said. You talked about a balance, an equilibrium, of forces. However, there are letters from our television viewers in Studio 9 mail asking: What is balance? What is equilibrium of forces...

[Chervov, interrupting] Parity.

[Zorin] Yes, parity...

[Shishlin, interrupting] How does it take shape?

[Zorin] How it takes shape, and how it looks from today's viewpoint; I ask you to answer these questions.

[Chervov] If one consults a dictionary, the word parity means equality, and the word balance means equilibrium, or evenness. These terms are used in military affairs in assessing the correlation of military forces. The assessment of military forces is, of course, not simply comparing bare figures. It is, primarily, taking into account all factors in the strategic situation. This is, strictly speaking, recorded in the Soviet-U.S. joint statement of 1979.

The main thing in assessing the capabilities of the U.S. and Soviet Armed Forces is their nuclear might, primarily strategic nuclear forces. It would be wrong to approach their assessment mechanically, without taking into account other factors in the strategic situation, for instance, the different position, geographical position, of the two countries. The Soviet Union is forced to ensure military balance, not only in Europe, but also on our southern and eastern borders. The United States does not need to do this.

For the same reason, all U.S. forward-based nuclear arms, particularly intermediate-range nuclear weapons -- Pershing and cruise missiles -- are strategic weapons in relation to us. They are able to reach our territory, and are capable of changing the strategic situation, and therefore we must consider them as strategic weapons in relation to the Soviet Union. The principle, the observation of the principle of equality and equal security is possible only taking into account U.S. forward-based nuclear arms, large numbers of which are deployed around the Soviet Union.

It is necessary, in calculating military forces, to bear in mind another principle, which the United States and the Soviet Union were guided by in the 1970's, and which we are invariably guided by now. This principle consists of the following: The comparison and maintenance of the military balance between strategic forces must be maintained between the United States and the Soviet Union, which do not have such strategic arms.

In all other forces and weapons a military balance must be maintained between the NATO bloc and the Warsaw Treaty, including nuclear arms, and primarily in intermediate-range nuclear arms; specifically, between, on one side the Soviet Union, and on the other the United States, Britain, and France; in other words, between states having these nuclear weapons.

The United States would now like to change this principle, and compare only U.S. missiles and Soviet intermediate-range missiles. However, this is a false equality. There is no equality in Europe without taking into account British and French missiles.

[Shishlin] Other categories of arms should probably be taken into account.

[Chervov] Yes, quite right. By taking into account other categories of arms, particularly nuclear arms, one should compare states having these weapons.

Assessing the military balance is not an easy task. However, despite the difficulties, the conclusion reached by the leaders of many leading states on this question is unanimous. Currently, an approximate military-strategic balance exists between the United States and the Soviet Union, and between the NATO bloc and the Warsaw Treaty.

How do the trends look concretely? If one takes strategic arms, the existence of a balance in strategic arms between the USSR and the United States was repeatedly checked during the preparation of the SALT II treaty. We have shown it on a picture for television viewers. It is now officially recognized by both sides.

Today, it is confirmed by many competent organizations in the West, including in the United States. Concerning intermediate-range nuclear arms, the United States alleges that the Soviet Union has a superiority, and is quoting ratios of 10 to 1, 6 to 1, but all that is not true. Today, the NATO countries have an advantage. I have shown figures on the screen so the viewers can see the real correlation in intermediate-range nuclear arms. The advantage is with NATO, both in carrier rockets and aircraft, and in the number of nuclear warheads. The Soviet Union has 850 carrier rockets today, and about 2,000 nuclear warheads; NATO, 990 carrier rockets, and about 3,000 nuclear warheads. Despite this, the Soviet Union has unilaterally halted until November of this year the deployment of intermediate-range weapons and the implementation of other countermeasures in Europe, while the United States continues to deploy Pershing and cruise missiles in Europe...

[Shishlin, interrupting] It seems that they want to deploy all the Pershings this year.

[Chervov] Things are going that way.

[Zorin] Will this not upset the balance, Nikolay Fedorovich?

[Chervov] Yes, it will. Already it is tilted to NATO. If they continue to deploy Pershing and cruise missiles, of course the balance will be upset. Therefore, obviously the Soviet Union will adopt appropriate measures. Our moratorium has been set until the month of November. In the West, they deliberately distort the true picture of the correlation of forces in intermediate-range nuclear arms. The NATO side is not counting the British and French missiles, as if they were somewhere on the moon and did not affect the balance of forces. U.S. carrier aircraft are not counted. In brief, the total balance sheet does not include 450 weapons carriers and over 1,500 nuclear warheads. For the Soviet Union, they count all the arms, including those located in the east of the country, which have no relation at all to the European balance sheet.

There is an approximate military parity in conventional armed forces between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The picture here is as follows: The NATO bloc surpasses the Warsaw Pact in the total number of personnel, the number of combat-ready divisions, and antitank weapons. It has an approximately equal amount of artillery and armored vehicles. NATO concedes slightly to the Warsaw Pact in the number of tactical aircraft. On the whole, there is an approximate parity in conventional arms. The lie being spread in the West concerning Soviet military superiority is an attempt to conceal and justify the U.S. and NATO bid for military superiority. No efforts on either side to achieve an advantage now will be crowned with success. The other side will simply not allow it.

Economic Balance

[Zorin] In connection with what you are talking about, Nikolay Fedorovich, attempts have been made in past years to achieve superiority, to upset the balance, in the economic field also. Ideas have been expressed fairly openly and loudly in Washington about imposing an arms race on the Soviet Union that is incompatible with its economy, about disorganizing the Soviet economy, and thus upsetting the balance on this side, and achieving an advantage. In this connection, the reaction, especially that of Washington, to statements by Comrade Gorbachev at the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the conference devoted to the acceleration of scientific-technical progress is noteworthy. Attention was focused on two points; firstly, that they are very serious and far-reaching plans, which will considerably increase the economic potential of the Soviet Union. This is met with visible nervousness. There is also another point. In the opinion of serious observers, these Soviet plans show that all attempts to upset the economic balance through economic subversion have also failed, because the very fact that the submission of the serious plans we are talking about indicate that the Soviet leadership begins with a healthy economy, uses the healthy foundations of that Soviet economy, and, consequently, everything done during these years to undermine it has proved bankrupt. We have spoken about attempts to upset the strategic parity, about this not succeeding. What is your opinion of its political significance?

[Shishlin] The political significance is, of course, tremendous, simply tremendous. First of all, there is the possibility of engaging in constructive affairs, the possibility of peaceful labor for the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Then, the political consequences of an approximate military strategic parity mean the narrowing of the field of action for plunder, the policy of strength, the imperialist policy. Under conditions of military-strategic parity, imperialism is forced to act with caution. I think that military-strategic parity is precisely the basis, the foundation for attempting the search for fruitful decisions, attempting to find logical compromises for lowering the level of military confrontation. It is precisely military-strategic parity that has raised the principle of equality and equal security for the sides, and makes it possible, I repeat, to find logical compromise and achieve a considerable lowering of the level of confrontation, and of the arms race.

U.S. Claims of USSR Violations

[Zorin] One must say that despite the failure we are discussing of the attempts to upset the balance in its favor in recent years, the current Washington leadership continues to act in the same direction, and in the same spirit.

However, insofar as this policy is unpopular, Washington is trying to muddy the waters, so to speak, and to confuse the issue by talk; in particular it attempts to justify this line by claiming that the Soviet Union is violating the most important international agreements, particularly the SATL II and the 1972 ABM treaties. This has enjoyed very wide currency. Moreover, these versions are advanced in Washington at the highest level.

Nikolay Fedorovich, I want to ask you, as a representative of the USSR General Staff, to answer the questions connected with these versions.

[Chervov] All the U.S. Administration's insinuations concerning the Soviet Union's so-called violations of its SALT II treaty obligations are absolutely unfounded. The Soviet Union approaches the fulfillment of the obligations it has undertaken with great responsibility and fulfills them precisely. The United States has no facts whatsoever about the Soviet Union's violation of obligations.

In the attempt to accuse us, the U.S. side often reaches the point of absurdity. For instance, it maintains that the Soviet Union encodes certain telemetric information during missile tests which it supposedly needs for monitoring the fulfillment of the SALT II treaty. The Soviet Union does not encode information necessary for monitoring the SALT II treaty. Displaying goodwill, with the aim of solving the question, we proposed that the United States name the parameters that in their opinion should not be encoded. The United States refuses to do this. This indicates how farfetched the claim is.

Here is a second example: The United States maintains that the Soviet Union has supposedly developed a second and new type of ICBM, the SS-25 missile. However, the White House knows well that no second new type of Soviet strategic missile exists. What is passed off as a new missile is an old one, the SS-13, which we are now modernizing, in strict accordance with all the provisions of the SALT II treaty. References by Washington to this missile are being made to reserve for itself the right to create another strategic missile, the Midgetman, along with the MX IBCM.

Generally, it is worth asking, worth posing the question: Why does Washington resort to false and farfetched accusations? This is done with one aim: to justify its militaristic course before the public and to shift responsibility to the Soviet Union for U.S. actions to destroy the treaty system; it is being done, as they say, to pass the buck. The current administration called the SALT II treaty fatally flawed from its first day in power. This treaty has constantly annoyed the White House because it secures strategic parity between the Soviet Union and the United States. However, it could not reject the treaty immediately. That would mean exposing itself before the whole world. Therefore, the White House chose the path of casting aside the provisions of the treaty interfering with the fulfillment of their military programs.

[Shishlin] Pardon me for interrupting. Nikolay Fedorovich, generally I would say that all this waste of time surrounding the SALT II treaty that Washington started appears to be a requisition for new U.S. arms. Their version of our violation of the treaty is advanced to justify their own course.

U.S. 'Violations' Noted

[Chervov] Quite right. Creeping out of the treaty, the administration leaves behind a long trail of the crudest violations. I shall enumerate them briefly: In the beginning, it generally gave up on ratifying the treaty. Then it refused to leave in force the protocol to it, which is an integral part of the treaty. Abandoning the protocol, it gave the green light to another channel in the arms race: the creation of many thousands of cruise missiles.

A serious blow was thereby inflicted on strategic arms limitation. Afterwards, the administration began to openly bypass the treaty, particularly Articles 12 and 13, by deploying its Pershing and cruise missiles in Europe, trying to alter the strategic parity that the sides had agreed to maintain.

The United States rejected the principle of equality and equal security, which is recorded in the SALT II treaty. In defiance of Article 1 of the treaty, they are displaying no restraint in the creation of new types of strategic arms. Here, the decision to create a second new type of strategic missile, the Midgetman, is a most crude violation.

The United States is violating a number of other provisions of the treaty. For instance, it camouflaged ICBM launchers, hindering the Soviet Union's monitoring of them.

All these violations are the reason for the United States consciously moving to the breakdown of the SALT II treaty, and possibly the talks in Geneva, hoping to shift the blame for this onto the Soviet Union and clear the way for the arms race.

As for the ABM Treaty. The White House is following a line aimed at undermining it. "Star wars" and the ABM Treaty are incompatible. They are poles apart. It is a question of either/or. And President Reagan's SDI is a large mine under the ABM Treaty.

If the United States wrecks this treaty, then all the nuclear arms talks will have no meaning. The process of strategic arms limitation will be wrecked.

Geneva Talks

[Zorin] Nikolay Fedorovich has referred to the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, and I think that we should, however, briefly tackle this in the context of our discussion...

[Shishlin, interrupting] We do not have to wait long for the end of the second round of talks. A recess in the talks will begin on 16 July. Our viewers knwo that these talks are being held behind closed doors, and naturally what is taking place directly at the conference table is known only to those holding the talks. But the U.S. line is far from a sincere interest in a reasonable compromise, and this has become very clear. You can talk about it unambiguously. This is being mentioned by Washington officials, including Keyworth, science adviser to the President. He says frankly that one should not expect that any results will be obtained in Geneva this year. Here is another view on the future of the talks, which are important, crucial, and vitally necessary both for us and the United States, and not only for the United States and us. More precisely, U.S. Vice President Bush is now in Europe. He is touring several countries -- Italy, the FRG, Belgium, France, Britain, and Switzerland, where the Soviet-U.S. talks are now being held. Unfortunately, the point is not about Americans' coordinating some of their new initiatives at the talks for the purpose of submitting them for study by the Soviet side. No. Bush continues to use all his efforts, in accordance with White House directives, at getting the partners involved in the implementation of the "star wars" plans.

Regional Conflicts

There is one more point. While talking about the fate of the Geneva talks, which the Soviet Union is approaching them in a most responsible and serious manner, one must not overlook the general world situation nor the general development of international affairs.

The Geneva talks are not isolated from the world process, including world crisis situations, from the state of affairs in so-called hot spots. They have not become colder; these hot spots have not cooled down.

[Zorin] Nikolay Vladimirovich, you have touched on an interesting problem, which I think we should deal with for a while, these hot spots, conflicts in various regions. Western propaganda is trying to calm international public opinion, saying that they are conflicts, of course, but they are local ones, and not so dangerous. Nikolay Fedorovich, from the military point of view, are the conflict situations which we know of really local ones?

[Chervov] From the military point of view, it would be very dangerous to view these regional conflicts only as local. In present day conditions, they can always lead to a world war. First of all, in local conflicts there is conflict between the interests of many states of the world, including the United States and the Soviet Union. Taking into consideration that these conflicts occur against the background of mountains of stockpiled arms, all these arsenals may be put to use at any moment. Secondly, the local conflicts lead to an intensification of the arms race. Many countries already possess the most modern weapons. The United States is arming Pakistan, Israel, South Africa, and Middle East countries with modern weapons systems. Some countries are close to creating their own nuclear weapons, and some of these most probably have secretly produced nuclear arms. That is why local conflicts are real sources of nuclear war. The main cause of these local conflicts, I would like to emphasize, is the hegemonist policy of the United States and its aspiration is to remake the world according to its fashion, remake it according to its design. It is precisely Washington's interference in other states' affairs, its aspiration to create military bases throughout the entire world, that lead to crisis situations.

[Zorin] Nikolay Fedorovich, again as you have said, they lay their troubles at somebody else's door. Now intensifying blatant aggression against Nicaragua, responsible people in Washington -- that is to say President Reagan -- say plainly that the Soviet Union is striving to get a base in Nicaragua.

[Chervov] That, Valentin Sergeyevich, is nonsense. That is disinformation. The Soviet Union has no intention of creating bases in Nicaragua or anywhere else. This slander is needed by Washington to cover its military interference in Nicaragua's affairs. Military bases are the cornerstone of U.S. policy. Look at the map of the world. Over 1,500 U.S. military bases and military establishments are scattered around the globe. They are bases for aggression. These bases are full of nuclear arms, most of which are aimed at socialist countries. The United States declares many regions of the world to be its spheres of vital interest, as if there were no borders, no norms, no rules of international relations. It does not just make declarations, but sends troops there, conducts military preparations. This also takes place right on our doorstep.

[Shishlin] Nikolay Fedorovich, I would like to add that it seems to me that, precisely in the last few weeks, there has been some new element in U.S. policy. It seems to be releasing its brakes in what concerns its attitude to conflicts. Just take a look at the chain of the latest decisions. Congress has allocated $38 million to the administration for support of the contras. Congress has also revoked the well-known Clark Amendment, prohibiting the administration from providing military aid to the counterrevolutionaries in Angola.

Now, look at the Middle East. In the Middle East, regardless of the events occurring there, the real fact is that the military presence of the United States is increasing and clearly, in relation to the Arabs, the United States and Israel are adopting a position of -- that's all, but they say nothing; they demand the maximum from their Arab neighbors. [...Po otnosheniyu k Arabam dershutsya tak -- vse, a nichego oni ne govoryat. Oni trebuyut maksimuma at svoikh Arabskikh sosedey] . Congress has voted new funds to support the Afghan counterrevolution also.

Change in U.S. Policy

Of course these circumstances, Valentin Sergeyevich -- returning to your question about the fate of the Geneva talks -- also influence the course of the Genevatalks and Soviet-U.S. relations as a whole, and without current corrections to the U.S. position, it is difficult to count on a dynamic and productive outcome for these Geneva talks.

[Zorin] Now, if we talk about the Geneva talks, and what you have said about brakes, the impression is created, if we analyze Washington's policy in the past 5 to 6 months, that we are dealing with a new zig-zag. Now, everyone recalls that when the current administration began its activities, it demonstrated a harshness, a political harshness in relation to the Soviet Union, verbally as well; the evil empire and crusades were mentioned. Then, a little over a year ago, Washington's tone changed abruptly. It stopped talking about the evil empire, backed off from this harsh rhetoric and, on the contrary, began assuring everybody of their peaceableness.

This zig-zag came to an end after the presidential elections, which points to the political morals of bourgeois politicians. Now a new turn, a return to harsh rhetoric, and a policy of implementing steps which continue to supercharge the situation. This is an obvious political zig-zag occurring of late; besides, I have mentioned one of the reasons for this zig-zag -- the elections -- but it seems there is more to it than that.

Extreme power is being acquired in Washington by circles particularly closely associated with the arms race, and judging from everything, there is a growing inclination in the White House to heed the advice and directions coming from precisely these circles.

[Shishlin] Well, generally, Valentin Sergeyevich, this kind of military pepper is in vogue in Washington, as far as the preparation of political dishes is concerned, and it is clear that they want to keep the United States and international relations in heated conditions.

Nevertheless, it is very important that the world political climate is not formed only in Washington, or so much by Washington. We spoke of this when, at the beginning of our discussion, we dwelt on the topic of the political and strategic situation as a whole. Generally, the dynamics of the development of events here is far from being positive for the United States.

Soviet Policy

Now, you have already mentioned that, at the end of June, the 40th anniversary of the signing of the UN Charter was observed. Of course, the lesson of that time, and of the past decades, a great lesson, lies in the fact that there is, and can be, a common denominator among countries belonging to different social systems, more precisely, an interest in preserving peace and development of peaceful cooperation. Has this common interest, this common denominator disappeared? Has it been eroded by the passage of time? Unequivocably not.

A difficult and complicated struggle is now under way for the creation of conditions and the creation of prerequisites that would permit realization of a turn for the better. In this, Soviet foreign policy has utterly clear guidelines. We truly support a revival of detente, a revival of confidence, and the establishment of a durable and firm peace.

I would like to cite what Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said at the Central Committee April Plenum. He said: We firmly support the revival of the process of detente. But this does not mean a simple return to what was achieved in the 1970's.

It is necessary to strive for much more. From our point of view, detente is not the ultimate aim of politics; it is essential, but it is only a transitional stage from a world encumbered with weapons to a reliable and universal system of international security.

Now, this policy, an active policy, is also undoubtedly a prospective policy.

[Zorin] Well, our time has run out. It remains for me to thank you for participating in our discussion. Obviously, we did not have the opportunity to deal with all the questions, but we are not discussing these questions for the last time. Thank you, comrade television viewers, for your attention. Thank you. All the best to you.

PRC, U.S. MEDIA REACTION TO GORBACHEV SPEECH NOTED

PM010819 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS 27 Jun roundup: "Following a Course of Peace and Creation"]

[Excerpts] While implementing an impressive program for accelerating the country's socioeconomic development, the Soviet Union makes tremendous efforts to uphold peace and protect the earth against nuclear catastrophe and resolutely advocates the prevention of an arms race in space and the ending of the arms race on earth. That is the leitmotiv of the broad international reactions to CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's speech in Dnepropetrovsk.

The Soviet leader, the Chinese news agency XINHUA reports, stated that the USSR intends to actively promote the full overcoming of the negative patch in Soviet-Chinese relations, and stressed that he is confident that this will ultimately happen. He said: "I think time has shown both sides that neither of them gains from disunity, still less from unfriendliness and suspicion."

M.S. Gorbachev warned that the Soviet Union will have to reassess the whole situation if the United States drags out the Geneva talks, THE NEW YORK TIMES writes. This statement is the most serious warning so far that the talks could be wrecked because of the U.S. plans which are widely known as the program of preparations for "star wars." The CPSU Central Committee general secretary described the U.S. program as a blank wall barring the path to the attainment of corresponding agreements in Geneva. Moscow states that it cannot again allow the talks to be used to divert attention and provide a cover for military preparations, the aim of which is to ensure U.S. strategic superiority and a line of world domination. The Soviet Union also stated that it will not allow the United States to use trade to interfere in its internal affairs.

The U.S. news agency UPI, for its part, notes that, as M.S. Gorbachev stated, Washington is using the Geneva talks as a cover for building up U.S. military potential, which is aimed at inflicting a nuclear strike on the Soviet Union; the attainment of serious accords apparently does not enter into U.S. plans. At the same time, the U.S. press published a statement by a White House spokesman from which it is clear that the Washington administration intends to continue to implement militarist programs and step up the arms race.

ACADEMICS DEBATE 'CIVILIZED' EAST-WEST TIES

PM271524 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Jun 85 p 2

[Round table feature: "East-West: Civilized Relations. Necessity? Reality? Utopia?" -- first paragraph is LITERATURNAYA GAZETA introduction]

[Text] The search for an alternative to the line pursued by the West of confrontation and an arms race is an important goal of the USSR's policy at the present stage. The following "round table" between Soviet scientists specializing in international affairs -- Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin, Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Fedor Mikhaylovich Burlatskiy -- is devoted to this problem.

[Burlatskiy] The fundamental question of present-day world development is, of course, the question of East-West relations, and it is appropriate now to think not only of current problems but of the ultimate foundations of some kind on which relations between socialist and capitalist countries should certainly be based in the nuclear age. Not so long ago M.S. Gorbachev came up with the idea of civilized relations in the world arena. It would be interesting to imagine what this means in practice. What amount of principles, norms, and practical actions does it cover? In other words, what is the "ideal model" for East-West relations?

[Zagladin] The actual problem of civilized relations arose, as I understand it, in connection with the fact that at the current time they are clearly not civilized in nature, and this is linked with the fact that one of the two sides in practice rejects the principles of such relations. The leading capitalist power, the United States, approaches the development of relations between countries and the development of the world as a whole not from the viewpoint of consideration of the real state of affairs, but from the viewpoint of its own egoistic interests and subjective goals.

I recall that after the October Revolution President W. Wilson called for workers' rule in the USSR to be destroyed and in general for this concept to disappear forever. Here there is direct continuity with today, but of course what I have just said certainly does not mean that civilized relations between the two systems are impossible. What is needed for this first and foremost is realism in the approach to the modern world and acceptance of it as it is, and correspondingly, realism in posing your own goals and tasks and assessing your own capabilities in the struggle to achieve your goals.

[Burlatskiy] This, so to speak, is the destructive side of the problem, the things that hinder the establishment of civilized East-West relations. There is also a constructive side: With what interests -- state, national, or class -- do these sorts of relations accord?

[Yakovlev] I think that there are objective grounds for the establishment of civilized relations. Mutual relations between countries with different social systems -- for all the differences existing between them in terms of the social class nature of society, the political system, ideology, and so forth -- can and must be stable, even, and correct in nature. The norm for relations between the two systems must not be confrontation, but peaceful coexistence. This is the only sensible basis for normal mutual relations between the two systems. What alternative is there? Dangerous war brinkmanship with an extreme risk that a universal catastrophe may happen at any moment. Does this really accord with the interests of any country?

[Zagladin] Of course it accords with nobody's interests if you mean the genuine legitimate interests of countries and peoples.

Every country has such interests. These are above all security interests, interests of survival, so as to speak. I think that not only working people but also the bourgeoisie are interested in this. Are Morgans and Rockefellers really unafraid of nuclear fire?

Now all people, at any rate, all civilized people, have come to the conclusion that nuclear war would be fatal for all mankind. The CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet, and USSR Council of Ministers appeal states this with utter clarity. Therefore the first principle which must form the foundation of civilized relations is the recognition that war does not ensure anyone's security and cannot solve any problems.

[Burlatskiy] In the twenties and thirties both sides -- capitalism and socialism -- were convinced that war between them was inevitable by virtue of the opposite nature of their systems. But life proved to be more complex. World War II started within the capitalist system, but ultimately the countries that once participated in intervention against the Soviet Union -- Britain, France, and the United States -- were our allies in the common struggle against fascism. That is a practical lesson which history has taught us and which must never be forgotten. Exactly 40 years have passed since the victory and, fortunately, it has been possible to avoid a war, despite the acute confrontation which the West has launched against us from time to time.

But the question is: what specific expression should be given to the formula of civilized relations?

[Yakovlev] Differing viewpoints on this score are expressed among scientists and politicians. But certain imperatives of states' foreign policy behavior within the framework of this model seem, if not obvious, fully suited to discussion. I would cite the following principles to begin with:

The goal of policy with regard to states with a different social system should not be to alter their existing system -- whatever the considerations of a social class, ideological, or political nature motivating this.

The use of force in mutual relations between states must be eschewed once and for all and problems must be resolved by way of talks taking mutual interests into account on the basis of sensible compromises.

It is necessary to abandon once and for all the illusions of acquiring "absolute invulnerability" via a large-scale buildup of military means; the paradox of the nuclear age is that increases in arsenals of mass destruction weapons lead ultimately to reduced, not increased levels of security.

In its activity in the world arena, each state must take account of the legitimate interests of other participants in international life and give the interests of cooperation and simply of maintaining even mutual relations with countries belonging to the opposing social system priority over transient political considerations, let alone ideologically conditioned stereotypes.

That is the minimum with which dialogue could be begun with our partners regarding a code of relations between the two world systems under present conditions.

[Zagladin] I think that ending the arms race is of particular importance. This is now certainly the main thing. The arms race, however it is camouflaged, is essentially preparation for war. True, the race may also serve other goals -- forcing peoples and states into submission without the direct use of force and even attempts to force other countries to capitulate. But this is an absolutely unrealistic approach.

The following paradox can be stated: If it is impossible to win a war, it is also impossible to win the arms race. It leads to deadlock: either the most terrible deadlock -- war -- or another kind of deadlock -- permanent confrontation.

Joint action is needed to strengthen universal security. It only takes one side to quarrel but it takes two sides to organize good relations. I would add here one further principle which is now probably very topical. The edifice of security must be built not only through the joint efforts of states, but by relying on the public, the peoples, and mass movements. Practice shows that to build security contrary to the will of the peoples and the antiwar movements is to build on sand.

[Burlatskiy] I believe that civilized relations are synonymous with active peaceful coexistence. After all, so to speak, a negative or passive coexistence in general took place even during the "cold war" period. Moreover, I think that civilized relations are a step forward even in comparison with the relaxation of international tension. It is probably a question of a stage of peaceful coexistence which inherits the best things from detente and means considerable progress along the road of joint actions aimed at eliminating the threat of nuclear annihilation, precisely joint rather than separate actions on the part of nation states and alliances. The ultimate goal of civilized relations is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. When we achieved military parity it became clear even to our enemies that these weapons are unusable and therefore militarily senseless. Of course, nuclear weapons are now a means of deterrence [sderzhivaniye]. But who has proved that conventional arms are incapable of fulfilling that function?

Incidentally, the principles we are talking about are by no means a recent invention. Both sides -- east and west -- have already made efforts to formulate some kind of code of conduct in the conditions of the nuclear age. And the documents of the seventies, above all the "basic principles of relations between the USSR and the United States" are of particular value.

So what happened to our partners, why did they backpedal? Does not this call into question the very possibility and reality of civilized relations now and in the foreseeable future? Are they not an illusion, in view of our partners' position?

[Zagladin] I think that the retreat from detente by the United States and its allies is to be explained first and foremost by a struggle between two lines in U.S. policy which has never ended.

At the very start of detente -- at the end of the sixties and the start of the seventies -- a sensible and realistic line held sway in the United States. It was implemented by President R. Nixon and H. Kissinger. They understood and openly formulated the concept that, since equilibrium of military forces exists, there is no option but to organize normal relations with the USSR. Incidentally, M. Kampelman said approximately the same thing in one of his recent publications: Of course it would be better to destroy the Soviet system, but since we would destroy ourselves along with the Russians there is no option but to sit down at the negotiating table with them.

The struggle surrounding this simple dilemma raged constantly, and at that time realism had the upper hand. But at the same time, another line in U.S. policy existed and was even growing stronger, and its representatives were preparing public opinion for a turnaround. Perhaps this will sound unexpected but I think that one of the first acts in this struggle for a turn toward "cold war" was R. Nixon's forced resignation. It was clear that President R. Nixon would not implement this turn.

First, he had linked his name with detente, and this is always of great importance in the United States. Second, he was convinced of the correctness of this course and it was impossible to change his mind. And thus a means was found of getting rid of an inconvenient president. Actions repeatedly used by other presidents -- both before and after Nixon -- were used as the pretext.

Can it really be considered accidental that this happened in the period of preparations for the Helsinki Conference?

[Yakovlev] I would like to add something linked with an analysis of domestic policy, which promoted the formation and success of the "conservative wave" in the United States and a number of other developed capitalist countries -- Britain, the FRG, and Japan.

In my view, this is linked with the rise of a group which could be termed the "new group" in the monopoly bourgeoisie. This section of the bourgeoisie represents new directions in production -- above all military directions -- linked with the technological revolution. And it is having an active influence on the government. It strives to undermine or weaken the long-standing symbiosis between the government and the "old Wall Street bourgeois aristocracy" and mounts its attacks from a conservative standpoint. Put simply, this group demands a redistribution of the state cake to its advantage. These new groups of the bourgeoisie rely politically on small and medium-sized business and on a considerable section of the middle strata, which support a policy of cutting taxes and government spending and hope that unemployment will be limited through an increase in [business] activeness and that opportunities for private enterprise will be expanded.

Under the prevailing conditions, the new business groups have sensed that their time has come. The economic potential amassed by this section of the monopoly bourgeoisie has enabled it, taking advantage of the sociopolitical situation, to stake a claim to a place in the U.S. sociopolitical system and the system of influencing the levers of state power commensurate with its positions in the economy.

Moreover, the right-wingers succeeded in pinning the responsibility for the profound moral and political crisis that had shaken the West on the liberals and left-wingers.

[Burlatskiy] It is obviously possible to note a most curious interweaving of domestic and geopolitical factors.

In the seventies the United States was experiencing a crisis of leadership in the Western World and a crisis of its claims to leadership in the modern world as a whole. To paraphrase Dean Acheson's aphorism, it can be said that the United States had lost an empire and had not yet found a new role. The seventies were the watershed when serious shifts in the correlation of forces took place not only between socialism and capitalism but in the world arena as a whole.

[Zagladin] There is yet another important aspect of the question -- U.S. policy in the developing world. Striving for revenge in the spirit of the "cold war," conservative U.S. forces used events in Angola, then Ethiopia, Zaire, and so forth in attempts to show that the USSR is stepping up its "penetration" of the "third world." But even if you take Western sources it is easy to see for yourself that in all instances where some kind of interference has been ascribed to us our actions have been merely a response and were taken only after someone had already attacked one country or another.

An interesting detail is that the first Cuban advisers went to Angola with the Portuguese Government's permission. We started helping Ethiopia when it was attacked by the Somalis, to whom weapons were being supplied from Egypt and subsequently from U.S. bases. Well, of course, it is said that Afghanistan played a fatal role with regard to detente. But here's what is interesting: when the then U.S. secretary of state was asked whether it was true that events in Afghanistan were the reason for the refusal to ratify the SALT II treaty and for the turnaround in Soviet-U.S. relations, he replied that nothing could be more stupid than that assumption.

[Burlatskiy] Thus we can see that the turn away from detente toward confrontation was no accident, it was linked with the "conservative wave" in the United States and a number of other countries. But there is a question which inevitably arises. Are not our hopes and our struggle for civilized relations illustory, bearing in mind our partners' positions? What in fact are the fundamental political goals of the West, and first and foremost the United States? What do they want? To win a war without a war? To strengthen the West's elite position in the modern world, above all in the sphere of the economy? To achieve military superiority and use it -- how? Perhaps we must simply be patient and wait for a more sober and realistic course to replace the "conservative wave" in the West?

[Yakovlev] I think that in assessing the change in the U.S. political course in the eighties it is important to spotlight the main thing. Namely, Washington's orientation toward the wrecking of parity in the correlation of military forces between the USSR and the United States and the Warsaw Pact organization and NATO and the achievement of military superiority for the West. Parity was, essentially, officially confirmed as a result of the signing of the SALT II treaty, each clause and each figure in which was most painstakingly checked and agreed by the supreme political and military authorities of the Soviet Union and the United States over the course of 7 years of talks. As a result the equality of the two countries' strategic arsenals was juridically enshrined.

The events of the eighties showed that the United States and its allies had chosen a quite different path. The former recognitions of the equality of military forces were rejected, forgotten, or declared to be mistaken. And it was a question not of nuances of the Western figures' opinions and assessments, but of a change of political course. It was a change not of rhetoric but of policy.

What is the aim of the United States? Well, it is hard to penetrate the secret plans of the White House and the Pentagon, but I think that the U.S. and NATO military-political strategists proceed on the basis of an extensive collection of goals. These include the desire to ensure a dominant position for imperialism in the modern world, to secure internal changes in the socialist countries in the direction of the restoration of capitalist orders, to undermine the main forces of the world revolutionary process, and to weaken the economic positions of the USSR and the socialist community through an exhausting arms race. At the same time U.S. calculations and plans by no means rule out the direct unleashing of war against the USSR and its allies if the U.S. military-political leadership deems the correlation of forces favorable for such a decision.

[Zagladin] I think that the goal of directly unleashing nuclear war is now hardly part of Western plans. The hope of winning a war without war still exists. To use a billiards term here, they are hoping to pocket not two but three balls at once. First, they want to bring the socialist countries to their knees; second, they want to completely subordinate their allies to them; and third, they want to impose "order" in the developing world and eradicate whatever does not suit the United States.

That is, turn the developing liberated countries into a greater Grenada. That, of course, is unrealistic because it is unattainable, but these goals do exist.

We realize that the United States, which obtains a considerable proportion of its resources through imports, does have its own interests in the "third world." Naturally it is also interested in ensuring that these raw materials and oil, say, are safely transported to its country. But that does not mean that the United States has the right to declare whole regions a zone of its interests regardless of the interests of the countries within these zones. Otherwise scope for conflicts and therefore for a deterioration in the entire international climate will arise.

[Burlatskiy] Let us simplify the question. Can we come to an agreement with Mr R. Reagan on anything essential or must we wait for a different trend to prevail in U.S. policy?

[Zagladin] As for Mr. Reagan, I do not know him personally and therefore cannot say anything on that subject. As for the future, I am nonetheless convinced that the Americans are a nation that possesses common sense. There are, of course, a mass of different people and viewpoints over there, but I would like to hope that a realistic understanding of their own interests would ultimately prevail. But, once again, on what does this depend? On the correlation of forces in the world. First and foremost on the strengthening of socialism and our active policy. And then on a change in the world situation -- in the Asian countries, which are nonetheless traveling the path of independent development, and in Latin America, which is undoubtedly turning into a major political and economic center of the modern world. This deprives the United States of hopes of maintaining its hegemony.

At the risk of seeming paradoxical again, I would not link the normalization of East-West relations with the ebbing of the "conservative wave." Moreover, certain conservative politicians may, under certain conditions, show more inclination for normalization and the development of civilized relations on the international scene than certain liberals. Let us recall Mr R. Nixon once again. Was he a liberal? Certainly not. He was a right-winger who made no secret of his views -- including his anticommunist views. But, I repeat, he was more of a realist than his successors. It is absolutely impossible to rule this out in other cases too. Of course, if truly liberal forces were to come to power in the United States they might be more active in pursuing a civilized policy. But nonetheless it is hardly justified to directly link one thing with the other.

[Burlatskiy] One should probably also take into account such an important factor in world politics as the West European countries' influence. I think that the foundations of detente have persisted on the European Continent, despite the sharp deterioration in the entire international situation. Agreements and accords in the military sphere (ABM, SALT I and II) remain in force, on the whole political contacts between the leaders of the capitalist and socialist European states are quite regular, and numerous trade, economic, scientific, and technical agreements are being successfully implemented. Even in an atmosphere of a sharp international chill nobody in West Europe has ventured or is venturing to issue an open challenge to peaceful coexistence. Moreover, by the mid-eighties understanding of the need to maintain the foundations and further develop the process of detente has deepened in many West European countries.

[Yakovlev] Yes, there is no doubt that a great deal in world politics will depend on what positions the West European countries take on the main international political problems.

The formation of a West European center, whose nucleus is the EEC, and the expansion of its economic and political activity have turned West Europe into a special region in the system of present-day international relations that plays a role comparable to that of the United States in many spheres.

But, unfortunately, it is not always nor on all questions that the constructive principle in the West European states' policy prevails over the negative, confrontational trend, whose intensification has been particularly marked since the end of the seventies. A considerable part of the responsibility for the exacerbation of the international situation is borne by the West European countries participating in NATO.

Furthermore, there are increasing differences of opinion among the countries of this region on a number of fundamental security problems. Thus, the present French leadership, which was the first to oppose the U.S. plans for creating strike space arms, is gradually coming down in favor of detente. At the same time, the FRG, which has followed in the footsteps of U.S. militarist ambitions, is on the extreme wing. True, even the FRG sets considerable store by expanding and intensifying economic ties with the socialist states.

[Zagladin] In general, it must be said that nothing disappears without a trace in history, especially not detente. Detente is often identified with a complex of various measures, but it seems to me that it should be approached more broadly. It is not just a complex of measures, it is a definite stage of development between countries with different social systems, and, as I see it, a stage which is not an ultimate goal but a transitional stage, that is, a transition to normal, stable, and civilized relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence. And this very stage of transition which was implemented with considerable difficulty after the long "cold war" period, which benefited nobody, could not disappear without a trace. It was the most convincing proof that normal East-West relations are possible. The material fruits which it bore also remain. I am thinking of the coordinated system of economic, cultural, technical, and tourist ties, and so forth. It continues to exist although it perhaps functions unevenly.

What prevents greater flourishing of these "fruits" on the European Continent? When you talk about this with West Europeans they reply: you want to make us squabble with the United States. But we don't want to make anyone squabble, everyone chooses his own allies. We want them, only bearing in mind the commitments that the West Europeans have toward the United States, to nonetheless visualize a picture in which Europeans could develop normal relations on a continental scale without being subject to outside sanctions. No one asks anything more.

[Burlatskiy] When speaking of the problems of civilized relations between the two systems one cannot fail to touch upon questions of ideological struggle. The style and forms of this struggle -- an inevitable struggle that lies at the very foundation of our systems -- can and do differ. The style was quite different during our common struggle against fascism. It has even changed in the postwar period. The West now imposes on us a style of hostility whereby the other side is seen as the enemy, and even enemy number one. This is the style of military psychosis or psychological warfare. It is certainly also one of the indicators of a lack of civilization. Evidently it is necessary to seek forms and methods of ideological struggle which do not hinder cooperation among the peoples in the interests of peace and which prepare the peoples not for the idea of the inevitability of conflicts, confrontation, and military upheavals, but for the need for mutual understanding and joint actions against the nuclear threat.

The U.S. Administration's behavior in the world arena is common knowledge. It is typified by belligerence, expansionism, and self-assurance. But the present U.S. leaders spice all this with rhetoric about "noble aims" and the "defense of peace" and try to use the "Soviet threat" as justification.

[Yakovlev] In fact, U.S. policy is dictated by the purely egoistic interests of the U.S. oligarchy. It is broader in scope and more significant than anti-Sovietism and anticommunism. The U.S. political and economic course is hostile to the national interests of most countries of the world.

For instance, the economic situation in the United States at the end of 1979 nudged its leaders into a policy which only served the interests of the U.S. bourgeoisie. Thus J. Carter made the turn toward new tension in the international situation. The refusal to take part in the Moscow Olympics, the grain embargo, the curtailment of scientific and cultural ties, and the development of subversive propaganda -- all this was subordinated to the egoistic interests of the economic elite. What place was there for civilized relations here?

High U.S. interest rates have made Europe an extremely unreliable refuge for capital investment. An enormous flow of investment has streamed across the Atlantic from an "old continent" living under the "Soviet threat." Wealthy European families have built houses and apartments in New York or Los Angeles as a refuge in the event of serious military danger. U.S. real estate prices have skyrocketed. Demand for dollars and the "greenback" exchange rate have taken off. Thus, hundreds of millions of dollars have left Europe in the period since January 1980, when President Carter announced the sanctions against the USSR. Europe's economic development has been retarded and spending on scientific research has fallen. In other words, the policy of tension declared and organized by the U.S. Administration is costing West Europe dear, reducing its economic competitiveness vis-a-vis the United States.

But tension, like any sick organism, needs injections: new scandals, insinuations, boycotts, fabrications about new "communist misdeeds," and new provocations concerning "human rights," a problem which U.S. politicians have turned into a farce, are needed. Emotions, outbursts of feelings of hatred, passions, and fears about, say, the terrorism organized by the U.S. special services or the shaky "Antonov affair" are needed. All this has profited and continues to profit the Americans, but it inevitably elbows West Europe aside from positions of real influence on world affairs or else channels this influence in a pro-U.S. direction. One way or another the U.S. policy of whipping up tension is increasingly clearly showing its anti-West European essence, to say nothing of the worldwide danger of this course.

Under these conditions it is impossible not to be struck by a gullibility for which billions have to be paid. One can only sympathize with the impotence and torpidity which sometimes seize the ruling forces of the West European countries in the face of the unceremonious and self-assured actions of the U.S. ruling elite. A great role is also played by the blinding commonality of class interests, which prevents people from seeing the world the way it is. And yet one cannot fail to be surprised at the chronic shortsightedness of those West European leaders who do not see or refuse to notice the enormous gulf dividing the national interests of this or that country from the egoistic policy of the United States, which ignores all interests except its own.

[Zagladin] Of course, we will never be able to eliminate ideological contradictions as long as the two systems exist.

That is a truism. But the question of the methods of the ideological struggle still exists. It is no accident that the West's psychological warfare poisoned detente, especially during the crisis of the seventies. But psychological warfare is an indicator of weakness, not strength. Bad language has never been an argument. I think that this exacerbation of the ideological struggle was linked with both international and domestic processes of development in the capitalist countries themselves.

[Yakovlev] The world public is now witnessing political trickery on an international scale. Ruling monopoly circles are fervently playing on tension and the "Soviet threat," dishonestly deceiving the peoples of their countries, scaring people, and manipulating their consciousness. Wheeler-dealers have joined in playing on the tension they themselves have created.

What next? War? The cranking up of hatred of socialism? A military-psychological "crusade" against communism? The choice is small -- it boils down to two possibilities: military catastrophe or peaceful coexistence. The intermediate form -- confrontation -- has its own somber logic. Gravitating toward military methods of resolving disputed international issues, it is fostering increasingly widespread protest. Fear of the artifically organized myth of the "Soviet threat" cannot endure forever. Time reveals the deception, removes the blinders woven from lies, and isolates the hired manipulators of public opinion.

But for the time being the United States and its destructive propaganda machine, which destabilizes the psychological atmosphere in the world, are working toward a further exacerbation of international tension of a type that does not rule out nuclear conflict. And the more quickly this is realized, the closer mankind will be to salvation. As for the "Soviet threat," it has nothing to do with it.

As is well known, norms of international law and numerous UN and UNESCO decisions exist which orient the mass media in all countries toward propaganda of peace, good-neighborliness, and cooperation. This is also an important aspect of the principles of civilized relations.

But if we look at the U.S. mass media, their work focuses on fostering hatred of socialism and the Soviet people.

[Burlatskiy] Thus, despite the continuing international tension, our party proceeds on the basis that a world nuclear war is not inevitable, that it can be avoided, and that peaceful coexistence and civilized relations are the sole alternative to thermonuclear catastrophe.

[Zagladin] Realism on the part of the leading Western political forces is also needed.

[Yakovlev] And their political will aimed at developing genuinely civilized relations.

WEINBERGER APPROVES AMRAAM MISSILE PROGRAM

PM281026 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jun 85 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Source of the Threat"]

[Text] Washington -- Building up its militarist preparations which threaten all mankind, the U.S. military is creating more and more new types of arms.

As the Air Forceleadership has announced, U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger has sanctioned the production of a new improved medium-range air-to-air missile under the name AMRAAM. It will replace the existing Aim 7 missile used by USAF and USN fighters.

The new missile is equipped with an automatic homing radar system. A fighter can launch 9 such missiles simultaneously. The USAF plans to acquire 17,217 and the USN 7,272 AMRAAM missiles, whose production will cost U.S. taxpayers approximately 7.5 billion dollars.

PENTAGON AWARDS CONTRACTS FOR 'SPACE ARMS' RADAR

LD290948 Moscow TASS in English 0936 GMT Jun 85

[Text] Washington June 29 TASS -- The Pentagon has awarded the companies Raytheon and Westinghouse Electric contracts for the development and construction of new advanced ground radar stations. The installations, capable of distinguising between nuclear and imitation warheads and of guiding laser and other anti-missile weapons, are considered to be one of the major components of the system of strike space arms.

HOUSE VOTE ON INTERVENTION IN NICARAGUA ANALYZED

LD292220 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 29 Jun 85

[From the Vremya newscast; with commentary by Igor Fesunenko]

[Text] Nicaraguan President Danitel Ortega has stated in Managua that the decision of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress to grant President Reagan the right to send forces to Nicaragua serves as an attempt to legitimize terrorism with regard to the republic.

This same end, he stressed, is served by the recent approval by Congress of multimillion dollar funding to finance the terrorist activities of counterrevolutionary gangs. The Reagan administration is practicing unbridled terrorism, it is trampling the rights of entire peoples, and it is placing in jeopardy the safety of all mankind, Daniel Ortega stressed.

Speaking at a press conference, the president stressed that, faced with the danger of direct armed aggression by the United States which has loomed over the republic, the Armed Forces of Nicaragua have been deployed in all strategic regions of the country and are ready to give a heroic rebuff to any venture of imperialism. Here is Igor Fesunenko, our political observer, who has just returned from Nicaragua:

Good evening, comrades. About 1 and 1/2 years ago, speaking at the United Nations, President Reagan quite seriously assured the delegates of the General Assembly that, in his relations with his neighbors of the continent, and I quote: We are trying to reduce the emphasis on the use of force, and create a framework for peaceful negotiations. Exactly a month after this, in the Nicaraguan port of Corinto, CIA agents blew up a fuel depot and then mined the port waters, as a result of which vessels of various countries were damaged, among them our tanker Lugansk.

At the end of this week President Reagan received yet another tool for the same sort of "peaceful solution" of the Central American crisis. The House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress granted the administration the right to direct military intervention in Nicaragua.

It is well known that even without this permission the White House, the Pentagon, and the CIA have been conducting an undeclared war for many months through their mercenaries against the young republic, which has become for Washginton almost its worst sworn enemy. Terrorism, murder, military sorties, arson, explosions -- Nicaraguans have experienced all of this, and now they can expect new, even more sophisticated provocations. A clear example of Washington's inventiveness can be provided by the directive, which has just been sent down by the CIA to its agents in Nicaragua, to organize a series of explosions throughout the country, distributing in the residential districts of towns and settlements, and especially in front of schools, childrens' toys stuffed with powerful explosives. You read this kind of thing and cannot understand the depths of moral decline to which you have to sink in order to make children your target.

Should we be surprised, then, that in Nicaragua even children consider themselves fighters and defenders of the motherland? On the northern border, in the little town Ocotal, I became acquainted a few days ago with a 13-year-old boy in military uniform with a submachine gun, which was nearly bigger in size than its owner. The boy, before my eyes, stripped and assembled his weapon with amazing skill in literally a few seconds, just like a grown-up fighter. This child's father had been killed by the contras; his mother had been driven to Honduras by the bandits.

I looked at him, at this child, and thought: What a tragedy this is that he is forced to grow up an orphan, forced to grow up not with a ball or with a bicycle, but with a submachine gun in his hands. At the same time, what happiness for him, for the little citizen, to consider himself already at school age a defender of his homeland.

Over the last months I traveled through nearly this entire country, along the Pacific coast, from the border with Honduras to the Costa Rican border; I spoke with many people, and I felt the cohesion and staunchness of this people, its readiness for any sacrifices for the sake of the defense of the homeland and of the revolution. For this reason, I believe however much the enemies of Nicaragua may rage, whatever resolution may be adopted by Congress, whatever base actions the CIA may come up with, and whatever the White House may plan, Washington will not succeed in repeating in Nicaragua the blitzkrieg of Grenada. This is not because Nicaragua is much more extensive in territory, and a much better armed country than Grenada; it is not a question of square meters nor of the number of submachine guns.

Washington is incapable of understanding the great force of the slogan by which all Nicaraguan people are now living: Nicaragua does not submit, and does not sell itself; a free homeland or death, there is no third way.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA PROFILES U.S. SENATOR LUGAR

PM271531 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Jun 85 First Edition p 3

[Vit. Trifonov article under the rubric "Detente: Who Is Against It?": "Riding the Hobbyhorse of Conservatism"]

[Text] The man's name is Richard Lugar. He is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which is the leader among a number of others on the table of hierarchical ranks in the U.S. Congress.

At the age of 25 Lugar entered naval school, after which destiny swept him onto the staff of the commander in chief of naval operations, where he settled down in the intelligence service. Whether the service was tedious or whether the naval officer suffered from seasickness, a couple of years later he deemed it prudent to retire to civilian life and live off the land in Indiana. That is a figurative expression, because Lugar was never in his life any kind of tiller of the land, but is the kind of person who lives off other people's backs and squeezes the land dry. In short, he entered the "family business" on a grain and livestock farm with a small factory for the production of food industry equipment.

Lugar was soon bored with that. Understandably. Why stay in this quiet "family business" in a godforsaken hole in Indiana, when all-American success and a place of honor on Capitol Hill in Washington beckon? Lugar saw himself as a high flier, holding sway in the heavenly realm of human ambitions. He had to start with small things though. First he fought his way onto the Indianapolis School Board as an ordinary member, but a year later he stepped onto the long-awaited first rung of a political career ladder by becoming vice chairman of the board. Standing on that rung, he looked about him for the loyal people he needed to lead him further up the desired ladder. He realized that the conservatives were the people who would bring him out. At that time conservative sentiments were strong among the ruling elite, with Richard Nixon setting the tone.

Singing the praises of Nixon and his entourage at every turn helped Lugar to reap his first major political harvest. He won the election for mayor of Indianapolis, and remained in that post for 8 years in succession. After taking up the post of mayor, Lugar set about paying his debts. When the Nixon administration put forward the antipopular program of "new federalism," which envisaged, among other things, a sharp reduction in aid to cities, Indianapolis was readily offered by its obliging mayor as a testing ground. After all, gratitude should take concrete form, and it was beside the point that the city's own people would be groaning.

His zeal was noticed. Appointments, promotions, and invitations poured in with breathtaking rapidity. In a word, he became "involved," entered the circle of "Nixon's men," and this culminated in a particularly ardent speech in support of his idol at the 1972 Republican Convention and his election, aided and abetted by the White House, as president of the National League of Cities. The newspapers called him "Nixon's favorite mayor."

Of course, in life anything can happen. Someone seems to be moving forward, surrounded by success, honor, and admirers, and all of a sudden there is a bolt from the blue. Something of the kind was to happen to Lugar when the Americans cast Nixon aside in contempt when he became stuck in the mud of the "Watergate scandal." Quick as a flash (for which he was likened to a pistol), Lugar jumped clear of Nixon's ship as it went down -- his naval training came in handy. Later, putting himself forward as a candidate in the elections to the Senate, he thoroughly trampled his recent object of reverence.

All the same, his entry into the Capitol, when it took place, meant that he required new allies, new connections in Washington's corridors of power. But Lugar, who had gotten his fingers burned once, was in no hurry, preferring to tolerate for the first few years the unflattering references to himself as a "colorless" senator. However, the convictions of the legislator from Indiana always held a certain place on the color spectrum, clearly tending toward the black [extreme right-wing]. In any event, his positions did not earn any complaints from the so-called "New Right" -- a diverse coalition of hundreds of black reactionaries.

For instance, Lugar never once voted in favor of curbing the Pentagon's immoderate militarist spending. He was one of the fiercest opponents of the SALT II agreement and fulminated against the Carter administration's treaties on the Panama Canal, taking the view that by concluding these agreements they had "sold America." Lugar besieged the White House with demands that it mine Iranian ports and establish a naval blockade when the people's revolution swept America's placeman, the shah, from his throne. Events in Afghanistan had the effect on him of a red rag to a bull. From every possible platform the senator called for a "practical response" in the form of the strengthening of U.S. strategic and conventional arms, the creation of new American military bases in the Near East, and, of course, unlimited supplies of weapons to the Afghan dushmans.

For the time being, they usually brushed him aside. His day came in 1980, however. Lugar's "agenda" at last coincided entirely with the program of the new White House incumbent. According to a report in the Philadelphia INQUIRER, "no other member of Congress was more in solidarity with the administration's policy."

"To underestimate our political will to deter Soviet aggression would be the most serious threat to peace," the senator declares. Note that Lugar wants political will to be manifested not in order to take the necessary measures urgently to normalize Soviet-American relations and end the arms race, but in order to build up the first-strike nuclear missile potential at an accelerated rate and implement as quickly as possible the crazy plan to militarize space. For Lugar, only blackmail "from a position of strength" can ensure "reasonable" talks on arms control. For Lugar, a tough line in relation to the USSR and the other socialist countries is the starting point from which Washington should begin all over again.

So it goes on, from the problem of "international terrorism" turned inside out, which must supposedly be resolved by means of "preemptive strikes" even at the cost of deaths among the peaceful population, to aid to the Israeli expansionists, Afghan bandits, and Khmer reaction. Lugar keeps a special eye on Nicaragua, which he regards as nothing less than a "threat to U.S. security." His "formula" for dealing with the Sandinist revolution is to break off diplomatic relations, impose total political, trade, and economic isolation, recognize the "contras" as the "effective government," and, finally, threaten to use American armed force. "I have always believed that what we need is all-out sustained pressure," he says, explaining his philosophy in popular terms...

It would be OK if such cannibalistic views were being set forth by an ordinary American senator -- you can hear plenty of that kind of thing in the Capitol. These views, however, are being propounded by the chairman of the leading committee on foreign affairs, which has substantial influence on the U.S. foreign policy course. So it is permissible to ask: Where is his sense of responsibility, of his lofty duty at least to his own people, whose true interests are in no way served by inflammatory calls for pernicious "all-out sustained pressure"? Will the cause of peace really gain through him? Is it not obvious that it is one thing to change course with every wind in Indianapolis, but quite another to concern yourself with responsible state affairs in Washington?

...Nearly 20 years ago Lugar's distinguished predecessor in the post of chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, W. Fulbright, in his book "The Arrogance of Power," wrote: "...America is now at the historical stage where a great country comes face to face with the danger of losing the long-term view of what is really within its powers, and what is not..." The senator from Indiana would do well to familiarize himself with the conclusions, still relevant today, which sobermindedness led Fulbright to reach.

LITERATURNAYA GAZETA HITS USIA EXPANSION PLANS

PM280840 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Jun 85 p 15

[Unattributed article: "Time To Sow Stones"]

[Excerpt] The USIA is an active organizer and proponent of all the anti-Soviet campaigns implemented by the Washington administration. It is tasked with implementing long-term, large-scale destructive foreign policy programs and propagandizing "the American way of life" abroad. The USIA is essentially a specialized department for subversive foreign policy propaganda operating in all parts of the world. (It is worth noting that the dissemination of USIA output is prohibited in the United States itself). The main tasks of Mr Wick's department are to provide cover for Washington's aggressive military-strategic concepts and hegemonist international aspirations, to sow enmity and hatred of socialism, and to fabricate anything that would damage national liberation movements in developing countries where the regimes do not correspond to "U.S. democracy." Particular efforts are made to "gussy up" Reagan's America, which has been reduced to tatters in the eyes of the entire world by its unemployment, persecution of the colored population, and working people's lack of civil rights and deprivation of elementary rights -- above all the right to life.

Ramified services operate under USIA auspices issuing U.S. propaganda through the media of radio, the movies, television, the press, and books, and by exploiting scientific, cultural, and other exchanges. The USIA is in charge of the Voice of America, whose annual budget is now $169 million and whose staff exceeds 3,000 people. It is not necessary to explain at length what Voice of America is. Its broadcasts, particularly those in Russian and the languages of the peoples of the Soviet Union, are currently openly anti-Soviet and provocative in nature. The radio liars spare no words or expressions in discrediting our social and state system, attempt to disseminate irresponsible political rumors, provoke dissatisfaction, encourage nationalist tendencies, and so not even balk at direct appeals to change the USSR's socioeconomic setup.

The USIA has decided to allocate more than $1 billion for the technical modernization of Voice of America in the next 5 years. It is planned to build new radio stations and re-equip old ones in Europe, Asia, and Latin America. A special radio station has recently been created to conduct subversive broadcasting against Cuba. Powerful relay centers are being built in Morocco and Israel for broadcasts to the USSR.

USIA printed materials and publications give pride of place to blunt and deliberate falsifications of Soviet-U.S. relations and at all costs peddle a distorted assessment of the U.S. stance on questions of disarmament and arms control. The USIA's radio stations persistently want to convince their foreign listeners that the fault for the deterioration of relations between the USSR and the United States lies with the USSR. The siting of U.S. medium-range missiles in West Europe is presented as the "restoration of the military equilibrium disrupted by the Russians." The transfer of the arms race to space and the siting there of strike nuclear weapons is allegedly being done to defend the United States from Soviet missiles. And so on, and so forth...

The USIA uses for its overseas presenters ranking Reagan administration officials, including Defense Secretary C. Weinberger, and figures well known for their anti-Sovietism and anticommunism such as Z. Brzezinski and suchlike. Nor does the USIA balk at the services of all kinds of renegades, Zionists, former Nazis, reactionaries of every hue, and people who speak their former native tongue with a marked, usually American, accent.

The leaders of the subversive propaganda centers and their boss C. Wick personally are pinning particular hopes on the starts of the DBS (the direct television system) era, aimed at other countries via communications satellites. The Soviet Union and the socialist community countries, like many developing states, have repeatedly proposed that this piracy of the airwaves be ruled out of order both today and in the future and that legal responsibility be established for broadcasts damaging the cause of peace and the peoples' security, representing interference in the internal affairs of other states, infringing basic, universally recognized human rights, containing propaganda of violence and terror, undermining the foundations of civilization and culture, and disinforming the population. However, all efforts to place the new development on a healthy and regulated footing in the mutual interest of all have encountered fierce opposition from the Western countries, above all the United States. The U.S. representatives at the United Nations and its specialized [otraslevyy] organs have done everything to block preparations for a corresponding international convention on the pretext of the so-called "free flow of information."

In particular, at organizations such as UNESCO, which is called upon to promote the development of national cultures and international intercourse among countries and peoples, the United States has tried to impose on its members its own approach to the resolution of these noble tasks. The U.S. line at UNESCO has been rightly termed "information piracy" and "cultural imperialism." Seeing that this line has no chance of success, the United States quit UNESCO.

The USIA already has a special subunit tasked with conducting television propaganda to other countries via the U.S. Worldnet system. In the words of the same C. Wick, Worldnet "heralds the start of a new era in USIA's activity."

Those are the far-reaching plans of the ideological saboteurs entrenched in the immediate vicinity of the White House and enjoying its direct patronage, and it is now proposed that we cooperate with them!

No, gentlemen, spare us that! To participate in the work of a television system whose programs are constructed according to the same laws as Voice of America broadcasts would to all intents and purposes mean sanctioning piracy on the airwaves, giving a semblance of legality and "objectivity" to U.S.-style foreign policy propaganda, and asserting the ideological saboteurs' "right" to interfere in our internal affairs. We do not recognize that "right" and never will.

We are by no means alone in our resolute nonacceptance of the plans for television propaganda subversion being nurtured by the Washington administration. Speaking at the United Nations, UNESCO, and other prestigious international organizations, representatives of the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America have repeatedly and sharply opposed the aforesaid "information piracy" and the attempts to flood these countries with a stream of tendentious information prepared in the West and to jeopardize the very existence of national information systems. The danger is universally recognized; "cultural imperialism" is unambiguously rejected.

The Reagan administration's secret aspirations were clearly formulated recently by Secretary of State Shultz. In an article this spring in the journal FOREIGN AFFAIRS, he announced that the "revolution in the sphere of global communications compels us to revise our traditional approaches to national sovereignty."

He also added that those who disagree with this have "virtually no choice": They will have to tolerate the ideological expansion of U.S. imperialism all the same. No, gentlemen, there is a choice, and nobody intends to tolerate a threat to national sovereignty from whatever quarter -- earth or space. U.S. references to the notorious "free flow of information" will not cover up the fact that it is a question of unobjective and often simply inflammatory information.

The objective laws of world sociopolitical development will undoubtedly find their expression in the breakneck growth of the role of the mass media, but it is a question of correct information, not of the dissemination of disinformation which would inflame enmity and hatred among states and peoples. The policy of the ideological neocrusaders and the attempts to establish world ideological domination can and must be countered by the truth, the revolutionary transforming nature of Marxist-Leninist ideology, and the advantages of the socialist system that are obvious to all. We are not scared of peaceful competition between the two inherently opposed social systems. The United States is.

"It is not necessary to have special political vision," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said in his report at the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum, "to see how imperialism has stepped up its subversive activity and coordinated its actions against the socialist states in recent years. This extends to all spheres -- the political, economic, ideological, and military. Fraternal party documents have repeatedly stressed that imperialism is trying to carry out social revenge on the broadest of fronts: both with regard to the socialist community and against countries that have liberated themselves from colonial oppression, national liberation movements, and working people in the capitalist states."

The desire to deepen and broaden the clearly subversive ideological expansion and link the entire world in the fetters of a space television network under Washington's control and serving imperialism and the antihuman aims of the United States and the USIA's global ambitions are all manifestations of "expansion on a broad front" in the interests of the most overt reaction. There is no other assessment of it. The Soviet public's assessment of the USIA plans and their response to them are determined accordingly.

U.S. PLANS FOR SATELLITE TV BEAMS TO USSR SCORED

PM271035 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 26 Jun 85 p 3

[APN article written especially for SELSKAYA ZHIZN: "Ideological Subversion Via Space"]

[Text] Reports which, on the pretext of the "free flow of information," propagate in every way U.S. plans to organize radio and television broadcasting for the population of foreign states via satellite are appearing with increasing frequency in the Western press. Radio stations belonging to the United States, the FRG, and other countries persistently give technical instructions on how to receive these transmissions in their broadcasts in the languages of socialist community countries.

As APN has been informed by the competent organs, the realization of these intentions affects the broad problem of states' rights and obligations in the matter of the international use of the mass media.

It is well known that specialists in UN bodies who have studied this question have come to the conclusion that international television broadcasting via satellite opens up enormous potential to increase the level of the population's culture and improve mutual understanding among the peoples.

However, the experts also noted the potential for foreign television broadcasts to have an adverse effect upon people's lives. Account was taken here of the experience of foreign radio broadcasting. As a result of many years of discussion, the UN General Assembly adopted in 1982, on the initiative of the socialist and developing states, "Principles for the Use by States of Satellites for Direct Television Broadcasting." They allow for the relaying of broadcasts via satellite specifically for a foreign population only on the basis of agreements among the broadcasting and receiving states.

This problem has also been discussed by technical specialists in the International Telecommunications Union, which has decided to allocate special wave bands for satellite television broadcasting. So far as the satellite television broadcasting service is concerned, the International Telecommunications Union has decided (and the U.S. representatives in the organization agreed with this) that every state should be assigned a zone to which its satellites may transmit a signal receivable by ordinary television sets. The national principle forms the basis of zone allocation. In other words, a state has the right to organize television broadcasting via satellite only on its own territory, apart from a few cases where a group of countries have agreed to have a single, common broadcasting zone (for example, the Scandinavian countries).

Thus, organizing the transmission of special television programs for the population of foreign states via satellite without the agreement of those states' governments would be a gross breach of international law, that is to say, the decisions of the International Telecommunications Union and the recommendations of the UN General Assembly.

Certain U.S. lawyers are trying to prove that the principle of freedom of information exists under international law. These claims have no real basis. All questions of disseminating mass information among the population of one's own country fall within the internal jurisdiction of the sovereign state in question. It is no accident that no unanimous opinion regarding this question exists in the United States. The well-known American specialist Professor I. Kristoll considers that if "a state deems broadcasts unacceptable on the basis of its own political, security, or other national interests, it may employ traditional methods of jamming."

The socialist countries do not advocate limiting the freedom of radio and television broadcasting, as the American mass media try to make out. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries fully support the broad movement in the world to establish a firm procedure for the international use of the mass media on the air waves, including various television channels.

Competent Soviet circles have informed APN that "pirate" television broadcasting via satellite may be regarded as ideological aggression. With all the ensuing consequences. Every state has the right to take measures available to it to counteract illegal television broadcasting, not only on its own territory but in outer space too.

U.S. 'MILITARIZATION' OF CANADA DENOUNCED

PM270957 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Jun 85 Second Edition p 3

[Captain Second Rank Ye. Nikitin "Commentator's Notes": "The Sky Darkens Over Canada"]

[Text] "The Canadian sky is blue and the rain falls on the birch trees, just like in Russia..." the Soviet popular song about Canada runs.

Yet, increasingly often the Land of the Maple Leaf, where the birch trees are like Russian birch trees, is showered with destructive acid rain, produced by atmospheric pollution from industrial enterprises in the United States, hears the thunder of exploding bombs and shells used by NATO forces as they rehearse methods of waging aggressive wars on Canadian firing ranges, and sees the ominous shadows of U.S. cruise missiles and B-25 strategic bombers as they fly past.

Canada's "similarity to Russia" also inspires some people in the United States. Not poets, however, but Pentagon strategists, developing more and more new weapons systems which they are thinking of using against the Soviet Union above all. As the Pentagon has repeatedly and cynically stated, that is why those weapons should be tested in areas which "resemble the Moscow region."

Many political observers are noting that Canada is becoming increasingly deeply embroiled in Washington's militarist preparations. Not only is it staging U.S. cruise missile tests but it is also being used to train U.S. Air Force personnel in Harrier AV-8B aircraft. A long-term Pentagon plan which provides for the testing of six new types of weapons has also become public knowledge.

Subunits of the West German Bundeswehr are also testing and assimilating the very latest types of military hardware on Canadian soil. The foreign press reports that the Shiloh firing range, 200 km west of Winnipeg (Manitoba), is being used for that purpose. The range is approximately 39,000 hectares in area. West German ground forces are being trained there. Each year 16 tank battalions and 8 motorized infantry battalions are trained there.

These facts demonstrate that Canada is becoming an increasingly active participant in the adventurist policy of the United States and the NATO bloc. Ottawa's practical actions show that it is obediently following its southern neighbor. Quite recently, the world learned about the Pentagon's plans to store 32 nuclear depth charges at Canadian military bases. The possibility of transferring B-52 strategic bombers to Alberta "in the event of a crisis" is also being examined. As U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger stated in an interview on Canadian television, "the day will come when the United States will perhaps want to deploy its armaments in Canada."

That day has already come, you may say. That is confirmed by the agreement signed in Quebec by President Reagan and Canadian Prime Minister Mulroney on the modernization of NORAD, within whose framework the so-called long-range radar detection and early warning system operates.

What is under discussion here? Primarily the establishment by 1992 of a chain of 52 radar posts stretching along Canada's Arctic shores from Alaska to the eastern coast of Labrador. It is planned to begin building the first of them this summer. Some of the posts will be built on the site of existing or previously dismantled stations belonging to the obsolete DEW-line, which at present has 31 installations. The other posts will be built in entirely new areas.

U.S.-Canadian military cooperation is given a particularly sinister tone by Washington's desire to involve Canada in the plans to extend the arms race to space. Critical Canadians are warning with good reason that the "chain of early warning stations in the north" is a "Trojan Horse opening the way to the subsequent deployment of a U.S. ABM system on Canadian territory. "We are embarking on a tortuous path which contains the danger of militarizing the north," Liberal Party representative L. Axworthy stated at a closed session of the House of Commons Foreign Affairs and National Defense Commission. "The idea that this radar system is purely defensive is absolute nonsense."

Washington's intention to involve Canada in its dangerous activity to militarize space is also demonstrated by the plans to conduct another series of U.S. missile tests next year involving the launching into space of the U.S. (Teal) Ruby reconnaissance satellite. That experiment, on which agreement was reached in Quebec, is just the beginning of Canada's involvement in the "star wars" program, G. Pike, a representative of the federation of American scientists, has stated. "The launching of this satellite," the scientist stressed, "will have a direct bearing on the creation of Reagan's wide-ranging ABM system." In that connection one's attention is drawn to a report in the Canadian newspaper GLOBE & MAIL on the Pentagon's intention to "house under the same roof" the purely American aerospace defense Command (ADCOM) and the joint North American Air Defense Command (NORAD), which includes Canada as well as the United States.

It should be added here, as the Canadian journal MACLEAN'S reports, that there is a "package of accords" forming an adjunct to the Quebec agreement, which envisage the modernization of a "dozen runways in the far north." By the end of this decade those runways will be able to accept AWACS-equipped aircraft. The runways will be used for servicing the "northern early-warning system" and for the deployment of squadrons of U.S. interceptor fighters in the event of international crises. "By beginning to accept AWACS aircraft and interceptors in the north, we will be involved, from the political viewpoint, in implementing America's offensive strategy," D. Blackburn, defense spokesman of the New Democratic Party, has stated. "I am very much afraid that we are allowing ourselves to be drawn into that."

The progressive Canadian press states with good reason that the White House has a highly "responsive" partner in the shape of the Conservative government. That is not denied by Canada's national defense minister, who has stated that the present government "does not consider itself linked" with the country's earlier policy. As though to confirm that idea he has announced a decision to send a 5,000-strong brigade to Norway in 1986 and increased the number of Canadian forces stationed in the FRG. Canada will also assign one infantry battalion to NATO's mobile forces.

The progressive public in Canada is demanding a genuinely peace-loving independent foreign policy. A concrete expression of such a policy would be provided by halting the U.S. cruise missile tests on Canadian soil, declaring the country a nuclear-weapon free zone, and cutting military spending.

It is not in Canada's interests to darken its blue skies with the leaden clouds of militarization.

U.S. MILITARY POLICY IN NORTHERN EUROPE VIEWED

PM201351 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jun 85 Morning Edition p 5

[P. Kononov article: "Northern Europe in Washington's Distorting Mirror"]

[Text] Recently the U.S. Administration has noticeably stepped up its political and military pressure on the north European states. Differences in those countries' foreign policy status compel Washington to use differing means of influencing them, but the essential nature of that pressure is quite clearly visible. Washington is trying to force Norway, Denmark, and Iceland to participate more actively in its military spending. As for Finland, finally, a clear desire exists to encourage some small but fairly influential circles who have set themselves the goal of slowing down the progressive development of good-neighborly relations with the Soviet Union and to undermine the country's constructive activity in the international arena.

Different forms of influence are being used to achieve the goals that the United States wants, but the whole campaign of massive pressure is based on the utterly false and long detested thesis of the "increase in the Soviet military threat" to the Nordic states. The myth of the USSR's "aggressive aspirations" is not new any more than is the tactic of intimidation and blackmail by the NATO leadership toward the small states belonging to that bloc or their neutral neighbors. Now, when Washington is sharply stepping up the arms race, whose danger is increased many times over by the plans to extend it to space, the U.S. policy and propaganda efforts in that direction are becoming increasingly intensive. That is no coincidence. People on the banks of the Potomac are worried by the reluctance of the Danes, Norwegians, and Icelanders, not to mention the Finns and Swedes, to support the U.S. plans for the militarization of space.

Washington has clearly decided that the time has come to undertake the collective conditioning of it's less than fully compliant NATO partners and, at the same time, the representatives of Sweden and Finland. Harvard University recently held a "seminar" on security policy in northern Europe which, in addition to those organizing it, included Swedish Defense Minister A. Thunborg, C. Bildt, a prominent figure of Sweden's opposition Moderate Coalition Party, Norwegian Defense Minister A. Sjaastad, and some Finnish representatives.

Although the "seminar" was held behind closed doors, information filtering into the press reveals its content. The tone of the discussion was set by U.S. Navy Secretary J. Lehman, that well-known apologist for the Pentagon's "new naval strategy" which is clearly aggressive in character. Lehman was trying to tackle a clearly impossible problem: to justify America's course aimed at stepping up military preparations in northern Europe.

Trying to pacify the Nordic public, which is alarmed by the plans to deploy U.S. aircraft carrier formations on NATO's northern flank (intended to deliver a direct nuclear strike against vitally important centers in the Soviet Union and other socialist states), the secretary denied completely that the United States is seeking an aircraft carrier presence off Norway's shores. At the same time, however, he did "clarify" the fact that it is within the competence of the Supreme Allied Commander NATO Forces, Europe, to decide to strengthen NATO's northern flank by directing aircraft carrier formations to that region. As we all know, the post of supreme commander is filled by U.S. General B. Rogers.

The real point of the secretary's remarks was soon "explained" by Admiral McDonald, commander in chief of the U.S. Armed Forces in the Atlantic. Unaware of his master's diplomatic ploys and perhaps without even considering it necessary to resort to deceptions, he told the journal JANE'S DEFENSE WEEKLY that the Americans are pursuing a policy of "offensive from forward-based positions," which means a "U.S. naval presence in the Norwegian Sea."

The Pentagon's aim is simple: It is to transform the Nordic countries' territories and their coastal waters into a bridgehead for aggression as part of the effort to achieve not only general but also regional superiority over the Soviet Union. The buildup of the U.S. military presence in the region is proceeding at a very intensive pace right now. For example, Norway's FRIHETEN reported that in spring of this year four large floating bases set sail for the North Atlantic from ports on America's eastern seaboard. Those huge ships, bound for regions of continuous patrol, contain stockpiles of arms for the 9th Marine Division, which is part of the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force. According to the Pentagon's plans, in a so-called "crisis situation" this unit will be transferred to Norway or Denmark on NATO's northern flank. U.S. military doctrine, FRIHETEN writes, envisages using nuclear, chemical, or various types of the most modern conventional weapons of equal destructive power or effect even in the initial stage of combat actions.

It is armaments like that which have already been sited on the floating bases, which will be permanently stationed off Norway's shores.

Nor is neutral Sweden left out of the Washington strategists' global militarist aspirations. DAGENS NYHETER has written in this context that, according to an opinion widely held in Washington, the U.S. Administration and other NATO countries ought to "step up the pressure" on Sweden to make it "increase its efforts in the defense sphere" and turn it into a kind of "shield under whose protection Norway and Denmark can 'feel relatively secure'." In other words, the United States would like to use neutral Sweden in one way or another to serve NATO's interests.

Mindful of the storm of protest aroused once in Sweden by a remark of the current Pentagon boss C. Weinberger, who cast doubt on Sweden's neutrality, J. Lehman, it is true, did acknowledge this major Nordic state during the seminar when he stated that "we want all countries to respect Sweden's neutrality." That aim is not as straightforward as it might seem. Lehman was trying at the same time to mobilize a provocative slander campaign over alleged violations of Swedish territorial waters by Soviet submarines. One cannot fail to recall here the recent remarks by Swedish officials who expressed doubt about the plausibility of the alleged violations of Swedish territorial waters by Soviet ships which in fact did not take place (and this has been authoritatively clarified by the Soviet side). However, it emerges from a recent official Swedish report on violations of the country's borders during the first quarter of this year that in the period in question Swedish air space was violated three times by NATO warplanes.

The groundless accusations against the Soviet Union, propagandized by the efforts of Lehman and other U.S. representatives, are designed to instill distrust toward the Soviet Union's peace-loving foreign policy, to gloss over Washington's militarist preparations, and to defuse the intensifying antiwar movement in the Nordic countries. This is also an attempt to pressure neutral Sweden and to draw it into the sphere of America's aggressive, adventurist policy, or at least to somehow weaken the Swedes' antimilitarist approach to the key problems of the present day.

Unfortunately, even Sweden itself has circles ready to succumb to Washington's spurious argument. This applies in particular to the leadership of the opposition Moderate Coalition Party, which tries to interpret Sweden's policy of "nonalignment" in such a way as to essentially depart from its principles.

Summing up what was said, one cannot avoid the conclusion that the seminar organized by Harvard University demonstrated again that as far as Washington is concerned any method will do if it helps to spread distrust of the Soviet Union's peace-loving foreign policy and to embroil the smaller European states, including those of northern Europe, in the militarist plans of the United States and NATO.

However, people across the ocean cannot ignore the fact that such efforts do not have the support of the Nordic public at large, which realizes increasingly clearly that the Soviet Union, which is guided by the principle of equality and identical security, has never tried and is not trying to alter the balance of forces in its favor and works sincerely to build relations with its northwestern neighbors on a basis of equality and mutually beneficial cooperation.

Under those conditions it is no wonder that the Nordic countries' representatives, including officials, taking part in the Harvard "seminar" did not consider it appropriate to comment at all in public on the essence of the U.S. elevations of the situation in Europe. It is to be hoped that in this instance silence does not betoken consent.

CHINA

PRC ARMY REORGANIZATION MEASURES REPORTED

PM271139 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Jun 85 Second Edition p 3

[TASS and "own information" report: "The Modernization of the Chinese Army"; first two grafs are TASS reports]

[Text] Tokyo, 25 Jun -- According to the newspaper ASAHI, a decision to reduce the PRC Armed Forces by 1 million men within the next 2 years has been adopted in Beijing. This reduction is directly connected with the modernization process of the Chinese Armed Forces and their equipment with new hardware bought in Western countries.

According to reports from Beijing, a reorganization of the military districts has been carried out in the country in accordance with a decision of the CPC Central Committee Military Commission which is chaired by Deng Xiaoping, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo Standing Committee and chairman of the CPC Central Advisory Commission. The number of big military districts has been reduced from 11 to 7.

Qin Jiwei, candidate member of the CPC Central Committee Polituburo, is Beijing Military District commander; Liu Jingsong the Shenyang Military District commander; You Taizhong the commander for Canton Military District; Xiang Shouzhi for Nanjing Military District; Li Jiulong is Jinan Military District commander; Zhao Xianshu Lanzhou Military District commander; and Fu Qianyou is Chengdong Military District commander. Yang Dezhi, Yu Qiuli, and Hong Xuezhi continue to head the General Staff, the General Political Department, and the General Logistics Department of the Chinese Army, respectively.

BRIEFS

CHINESE VISIT TO KIEV -- With an inspection of the Exhibition of Ukrainian National Economic Achievements, a delegation of aktivs of the Chinese People's Society for Friendship With Foreign Countries and the Chinese-Soviet Friendship Society ended its visit to Kiev. The visitors -- including scientists, writers, translators, journalists, and public figures -- for several days familiarized themselves with the life of the Soviet Ukraine and its capital city. A meeting was held in the Ukrainian Society for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries. Mutual interest was expressed in giving a new impulse to relations along the line of friendship societies. In the Kiev Gorispolkom headquarters the Chinese delegation was told about the prospects for city development. While visiting the Toky suburban sovkhoz, the guests inquired about the running of the farm, about the lives and recreation of the workers and employees. They saw the exposition of the Ukrainian State Museum of the History of the Great Patriotic War 1941-45 memorial complex, visited theaters and museums, and made a pleasure trip alone the Dnepr. [Text] [Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 1745 GMT 14 Jun 85 AU]

JOINT KOREAN ECONOMIC COMMITTEE TO BE FORMED

PM241918 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Routine Round of Talks"]

[Text] Panmunjom, 20 Jun -- A routine round of economic talks between the DPRK and South Korea has been held at Panmunjom on the military demarcation line.

At a press conference at the end of the talks Yi Song-nok, DPRK delegation head and vice foreign trade minister, reported that the South Korean side had accepted a DPRK proposal to form a joint North-South economic cooperation committee, which will be headed by co-chairmen at the level of deputy heads of government.

The sides agreed to hold committee sessions once a quarter, alternating between Pyongyang and Seoul. Extraordinary sessions will be convened in Panmunjom.

The DPRK and South Korean delegation heads exchanged draft agreements on forming the joint economic cooperation committee. It was resolved that the next round of economic talks will be held in Panmunjom in September.

SPORTS DELEGATION HOLDS TALKS IN PYONGYANG

LD272037 Moscow TASS in English 1001 GMT 27 Jun 85

[Text] Pyongyang June 27 TASS -- A Soviet sports delegation led by Harat Gramov, chairman of the Sport Committee and National Olympic Committee of the USSR, was on a visit in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) on June 24-27.

During the stay in Pyongyang, Harat Gramov held talks with Kim Yu-sun, chairman of the Sports Committee and National Olympic Committee of the DPRK, which passed in the atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding. The sides discussed some questions of the present-day Olympic movement, declared against the penetration of professionalism and commercialization into sport and stressed the need to combat apartheid in sport.

They also considered questions of furthering bilateral cooperation between sports organisations of the USSR and the DPRK. The Soviet delegation was received by Pak Son-chol, a member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers' Party and vice-president of the DPRK.

LE DUAN MEETS WITH GORBACHEV, STATEMENT ISSUED

PRAVDA Reports Talks

PM011119 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jun 85 First Edition p 1

["In the Atmosphere of Friendship and Cordiality"]

[Text] Talks were held in the Kremlin on 28 June between the party and government delegation of the USSR headed the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and the party and government delegation of Vietnam headed by General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Le Duan.

The talks were attended from the Soviet side by the member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Tikhanov: member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Andrey Gromyko; member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Secretary of the CPSU Central Central Committee Konstantin Rusakov; member of the CPSU Central Committee, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Talyzin and the alternate member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Ambassador to Vietnam Boris Chaplin.

On the Vietnamese side the talks were attended by member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPV, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party Vo Chi Cong; member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party, Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Vietnam To Huu; member of the Central Committee of the party, Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Vietnam Tran Quynh; member of the Central Committee of the party, head of the Foreign Relations Department of the Central Committee of the CPV Vu Quang and the member of the Central Committee of the party, Ambassador of Vietnam to the USSR Dinh Nho Liem.

The talks were held in the atmosphere of friendship and cordiality, of complete unity and mutual understanding which are typical of the fraternal relations between the CPSU and the CPV between the Soviet Union and Vietnam.

The delegations exchanged information about the progress of socialist and communist construction in their respective countries and on preparations for the 27th Congress of the CPSU and the 6th Congress of the CPV.

The sides expressed profound satisfaction with the high level of the development of versatile Soviet-Vietnamese relations on the solid foundation of the treaty of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Vietnam.

Representatives of fraternal Vietnam expressed profound gratitude to the CPSU and the Soviet Government, to the Soviet people in general, for the large-scale and effective assistance in building socialism and defending their homeland.

The Soviet side pointed out the progress made by the Vietnamese people under the leadership of the CPV in the struggle for national independence, for the building of socialism.

Participants in the talks exchanged views on the concrete directions of the implementation of the long-term program of the development of economic, scientific and technical cooperation between the Soviet Union and Vietnam and on the putting into effect of decisions of the CEMA member-states taken on the summit level.

Participants in the talks expressed mutual resolve to further deepen and improve fraternal Soviet-Vietnamese relations, the ties of close friendship and cohesion between the CPSU and the CPV which are based on the unshakeable principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism.

During the discussion of questions connected with the present-day development of the world, the sides reiterated the effectiveness of cooperation between the USSR and Vietnam, between countries of the socialist community, in international affairs. They went on record in favour of a further consolidation of coordination of the process of cooperation between the two countries in the interests of peace and socialism.

The Soviet and Vietnamese delegations strongly denounced the policy pursued by the reactionary circles of imperialism headed by the U.S. which is aimed at upsetting the military-strategic balance, at achieving military superiority over the USSR, over the Warsaw Treaty member states, by means of whipping up the arms race on the earth and spreading it to outer space, as well as the interference in the internal affairs of sovereign countries.

Participants in the talks unanimously stressed that today, when the international situation was characterized by dangerous tension, unity and cohesion of countries of the socialist community and the coordinated actions of all the forces interested in the preservation and consolidation of peace acquired special importance.

The Vietnamese delegation expressed full support for the Leninist foreign policy of the USSR, for its peaceful initiatives aimed at the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe and of the militarization of outer space, as well as at the improvement of the political climate in the world.

The USSR and Vietnam strongly denounced Washington's aggressive plans to turn the Asian-Pacific region into another arena of military-political confrontation with socialist countries. They reiterated their allegiance to the idea of turning Asia into a zone of peace and equitable cooperation. The sides went on record in favour of stepping up the search for ways to resolve problems connected with ensuring peace and security on the Asian continent.

During the analysis of questions connected with the development of the situation in Southeast Asia the sides stressed that the incessant interference of the forces of imperialism and hegemonism in the affairs of the countries of that region and their hostile policy with regard to Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea were the main cause of the preservation of tension there.

The Soviet and Vietnamese delegations reaffirmed their principled stand in favour of the normalization of the situation in Southeast Asia, the turning of it into a zone of peace and stability and the activization of a dialogue between all the countries of the region with a view to resolve the existing problems by peaceful, political means. The sides stressed the invariability of the support for the constructive efforts exerted in this direction by Vietnam together with Laos and Kampuchea.

The party and government delegation of the USSR again stated that the Soviet Union fully supported fraternal Vietnam in the struggle for the building of socialism, for the upholding of its independence and sovereignty. The Soviet Union and Vietnam pointed out the growing role of the Nonaligned Movement in the struggle for peace, against the arms race, for the restructuring of the international economic relations on a just and democratic basis. They expressed high appreciation of the substantial contribution made by India to the struggle for the consolidation of peace and security, the constructive role of that country in strengthening the unity and enhancing the prestige of the Non-aligned Movement in the world affairs. The sides resolutely advocate the elimination of hotbeds of tension and the peaceful settlement of conflicts in the Middle and Near East, in Asia, Africa and Latin America which are the direct consequence of the policy of interference of the imperialist forces, primarily the U.S., in the affairs of liberated countries.

The party and government delegations of the Soviet Union and Vietnam expressed conviction that the current visit would become a new step in the consolidation and development of fraternal friendship and comprehensive cooperation between the CPSU and the CPV, between the Soviet Union and Vietnam, in the interests of the Soviet and Vietnamese peoples, of the socialist community, of the cause of universal peace. Also taking part in the talks were: For the Soviet side O.B. Rakhmanin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee section, V.V. Sharapov, aide to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, L.A. Voronin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan, and M.S. Kapitsa, USSR deputy foreign minister; and for the Vietnamese side, Dong Ngak, aide to the general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee, and Dau Ngoc Xuan, deputy chairman of the SRV State Planning Commission.

Private Meeting Noted

OW281902 Hanoi VNA in English 1807 GMT 28 Jun 85

[Text] Hanoi VNA June 28 -- A private meeting was arranged in the Kremlin today between Le Duan, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee, and Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The two leaders exchanged views on the enhancement of solidarity and the efficiency of the all-round cooperation between the two parties and countries and on international issues of common concern. The meeting took place in an atmosphere full of friendship and fraternity.

Dinner Held

LD281538 Moscow TASS in English 1521 GMT 28 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS -- The CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers gave today a dinner in the Grand Kremlin Palace in honour of a party and government delegation of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, led by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam Le Duan. Present at the dinner from the Soviet side were Mikhail Gorbachev, Geydar Aliyev, Vitaliy Vorotnikov, Viktor Grishin, Andrey Gromyko, Yegor Ligachev, Nikolay Ryzhkov, Mikhail Solomentsev, Nikolay Tikhonov, Petr Demichev, Vladimir Dolgikh, Vasiliy Kuznetsov, Boris Ponomarev, Sergey Sokolov, Mikhail Zimyanin, Ivan Kapitonov, Viktor Nikonov, Konstantin Rusakov, other officials. The General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and Le Duan made speeches at the dinner. They were heard with much attention and met with prolonged applause. The dinner passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Gorbachev Dinner Speech

LD281614 Moscow TASS in English 1540 GMT 28 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS -- The CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the USSR gave a dinner in the Grand Kremlin Palace today in honor of a party and government delegation from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam led by Le Duan, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam.

Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, made the following speech at the dinner:

Dear Comrade Le Duan, Dear Vietnamese Friends, Comrades. It is with keen satisfaction that we welcome the visit to our country of a party and government delegation from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam led by Comrade Le Duan, general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPV. We are convinced that the visit will mark another important step in the all-round development and enhancement of Soviet-Vietnamese brotherhood and cooperation.

Soviet-Vietnamese friendship has deep roots and solid traditions. Standing at its source was president Ho Chi Minh, a great son of the Vietnamese people and a big friend of our country. This friendship has stood the test of time and been tempered both in the grim years and in the everyday life of peace.

The people of the Soviet Union and Vietnam march hand-in-hand, jointly tackling the tasks of socialist and communist construction and upholding the cause of peace and international security in the same rank.

We have held thorough and intense talks. Like before, they were marked by a cordial, truly comradely atmosphere. Both in the Soviet Union and in Vietnam work has got under way on a large scale now to prepare for the 27th Congress of the CPSU and the 6th Congress of the CPV. This lends special political significance to our exchange of opinions.

I think we may be glad with the development of Soviet-Vietnamese relations. Based on such a reliable foundation as the treaty of friendship and cooperation, they have now reached a high level and become inalienable part of the social life of our two countries.

Much attention was paid in the course of our conversations to economic cooperation. The Soviet Union and Vietnam are keen to tap even more actively the considerable potentialities they have to deepen their interaction in the field and make it more effective.

We are positive that this sharp political will will be fully embodied in the implementation of practical measures to jointly carry out the long-term program for developing economic, scientific and technological cooperation between the USSR and the SRV and in the coordination of our national economic development plans for 1986-90.

The problems of scientific and technological progress occupied an important place at the negotiations. Both sides are sure that it is only among its lines that it is possible to consistently accomplish social and economic tasks and conslidate the positions of socialism still further. Each fraternal socialist country is making a contribution of its own to the fulfillment of these strategic tasks.

The talks confirmed that the fraternal links of the Soviet Union and Vietnam rest on the firm, tested foundation of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism and meet the fundamental interests and aspirations of our peoples, the interests of world peace.

Comrades, this year the people of our countries, all progressive people on earth direct their thoughts again and again to the 40th anniversary of the great victory over German fascism and Japanese militarism.

The lessons of World War II remind mankind of how important and vital peace is. The value of peace is especially great now that another world war would spell disaster for humanity. This is why it is so imperative to take urgent and effective measures to remove the nuclear threat from the life of the present and future generations, to prevent the arms race from spreading to outer space and stop it on earth, and to turn international relations to the tracks of equitable and mutually advantageous cooperation.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union and other states of the socialist community, their ideas and proposals, the broad package of their peace initiatives have been dictated by concern for preserving peace on earth. Peaceful coexistence, the equal and dependable security of the sides, the lowering of the levels of military confrontation and world military-political tension as a whole, and the prevention of hegemonism in any form - this is what we want, what we are seeking to ensure.

A big contribution to improving the state of things in the world would undoubtedly be made if in its largest and most populous part, namely Asia and the Pacific basin, the political awareness of the acute need to move towards normalizing the situation prevailed. So far, regrettably, it hasn't.

One cannot but see that the United States of late has visibly stepped up its military preparations in that region. It is encouraging revanchist trends in the policy of the ruling quarters of Japan and pressing on with the forging of a militarist alliance of Washington, Tokyo and Seoul.

Washington is busy trying to enlist the countries of the region in furthering its global military-political plans, including the notorious "Pacific doctrine," it is interfering in the affairs of sovereign nations and obstructing the settlement of problems by way of talks. The edge of this policy is directed against the Soviet Union, Vietnam and other socialist states in Asia, against Afghanistan and Kampuchea. But by its very essence it threatens all nations in the Asian-Pacific region.

Naturally enough, such peace-endangering actions cannot but prompt the concern of the countries of the region and sometimes legitimate counter-measures.

The policy of the Soviet Union meets the nations' desire for peace and cooperation. We stand for eliminating the seats of conflict and counter the imperialist policy leading to a further dangerous destabilization of the situation.

Our country is prepared resolutely to cut the knots which have not been tied by us. For example, we are for reducing the level of confrontation in medium-range nuclear systems. We have declared on more than one occasion that should corresponding agreement be reached in Europe, we shall scrap the number of medium-range missiles in the European part of the country, on which the agreement will have been reached.

We have also stated our consent to freezing the number of missiles in the Asian part of the Soviet Union, of course, on condition that the American side will not take steps towards changing the strategic situation in the region. The Soviet Union would not be against discussing this problem with Asian and Pacific states having similar systems, with a view to limiting and subsequently reducing these systems on, it goes without saying, the basis of reciprocity.

We recently put forward the idea of holding in future a Pan-Asian forum to exchange opinions and jointly look for constructive solutions. The first responses to this proposal have indicated that there is gravitation towards such an exchange of opinions.

Certainly, there are difficulties, as well. Not all like such a vigorous placing of the issue. There are forces which have given a hostile reception to the idea. But we have no lack of good will. Patience and persistence. We urge all interested countries in the continent to display supreme political wisdom and get down in serious [as received] to the fundamental problems of strengthening peace and security.

We are convinced that Asia can and should become a continent of peace and good-neighborliness. It is only in conditions of genuine peace and stability that the countries of the region can successfully accomplish the difficult task of social and economic development facing them.

This goal is served by the concrete proposals of the Soviet Union, the countries of Indochina and other socialist countries, including the proposals for working out confidence-building measures in the Far East and concluding a convention of mutual non-aggression and non-use of force in relations between the states of Asia and the Pacific. The initiatives of India and a number of other non-aligned countries go in the same direction as these efforts.

Normalizing relations of the Soviet Union and Vietnam with the People's Republic of China would undoubtedly help fortify the foundations of peace in Asia and beyond it. Both the Soviet Government and the Vietnamese Government have already made constructive proposals on this score. A positive response to them could help tear down many of the real obstacles standing in the way of good-neighbourly and mutually beneficial relations in the region.

The Soviet Union believes, as before, that in Southeast Asia there are no problems that cannot be settled politically at the negotiating table. This is why we fully support the consistent efforts undertaken by Vietnam jointly with Laos and Kampuchea to establish relations of goodneighborliness and cooperation in Southeast Asia and make the region a zone of peace and stability. The Soviet Union will continue facilitating any steps in this direction in every way.

Comrades, the day is not far off when the working people of Vietnam will be marking the 40th anniversary of Southeast Asia's first state of workers and peasants. The Soviet people see this glorious anniversary also as a big holiday of their own. It is highly symbolical that in advance of this date it has been decided to erect a monument in Moscow to patriot and internationalist Ho Chi Minh, the founder the Communist Party of Vietnam and the Vietnamese socialist state.

The Soviet people have always identified with fraternal Vietnam and given it all-round backing and assistance. The Vietnamese communists, all working people in the SRV may rest assured that the cause of building socialism on Vietnamese soil, the cause of Vietnam's freedom and independence will continue to have a firm support in our solidarity. The policy of strengthening Soviet-Vietnamese friendship and cooperation is a principled policy of our party and country.

Permit me to wish to the communists and all working people of the SRV guided by their tested vanguard, the Communist Party of Vietnam, that they worthily honor the forthcoming 6th Congress of the CPV with fresh successes in building a powerful and flourishing Vietnam, a reliable outpost of socialism in Asia.

I wish sound health and successes to Comrade Le Duan, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee, the members of the party and government delegation and all Vietnamese and Soviet comrades present here.

Let indestructible Soviet-Vietnamese friendship develop and grow even stronger.

Le Duan Dinner Speech Report

LD281639 Moscow TASS in English 1627 GMT 28 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS -- General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam Le Duan, making a speech today at the dinner in the Kremlin, emphasized historic significance of the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism and militarism. He noted the successes of the Soviet Union, the socialist community, all revolutionary forces in the past four decades. "They opened real opportunities to establish lasting peace, brought a better life to peoples," Le Duan said.

But humanity continues living in a troubled atmosphere, he went on. The policy of confrontation, the escalation of the arms race and use of force conducted by the bellicose circles of imperialism, above all of the United States, heighten the threat of nuclear war, generate seats of tension and conflicts in many areas of the globe.

Le Duan spoke highly of the struggle that the USSR is waging to liquidate the threat of nuclear war, to preserve universal peace, of the Soviet Union's support for peoples taking the road of independence, freedom and social progress.

He stressed that the USSR together with other socialist countries consistently advances peaceful constructive initiatives. The Communist Party of Vietnam and the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam resolutely support these initiatives.

The Vietnamese guest welcomed the extension of the term of the operation of the Warsaw Treaty, the address of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers "to the peoples, parliaments and governments of all countries" on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the ending of the Second World War. Vietnam supports the Soviet Union's peaceful foreign policy course, the proposals advanced by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev aimed at ending the production and deployment of nuclear and space arms, at the ensurance of peace and security in the Asian-Pacific region, Le Duan said.

Despite all trials and difficulties, the Vietnamese revolution has been advancing confidently in the past ten years. The border war and subversive activity of the enemy suffered a defeat, Le Duan said.

The solidarity of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea is now stronger than ever, he went on. It continues strengthening. Our task is to ensure independence and sovereignty of every country of Indochina. We are striving for the establishment of good-neighbourly relations among all countries of Southeast Asia, for a dialogue replacing confrontation, for turning the area into a zone of peace, stability and cooperation.

As far as the People's Republic of China is concerned, we would like an end to the present tension, the restoration of friendship between the peoples of the two countries, normal good-neighborly relations, the distinguished guest said.

Assessing the treaty of friendship and cooperation between Vietnam and the USSR of 3 November 1978, Le Duan said that it plays an important role, serves as a basis for the development of relations between the two parties, countries and peoples that are based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, socialist internationalism.

Lomeyko News Conference

LD281856 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1624 GMT 28 Jun 85

["Briefing at the Press-Center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs"-- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow 28 June (TASS) -- A SRV party and government delegation, with Le Duan, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee, at its head, is in the Soviet Union on an official friendly visit. A meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Le Duan, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee, and Soviet-Vietnamese talks took place today. It is envisaged that a joint Soviet-Vietnamese declaration will be signed.

A briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists, at which a statement was made by Vladimir Lomeyko, head of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs press department, has taken place at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs press center in connection with this.

The Soviet-Vietnamese meetings and discussions, Vladimir Lomeyko said, passed in an atmosphere of friendship, cordiality, and complete unity of views. A broad exchange of opinions on issues of bilateral interparty and interstate relations took place, and also on a wide range of international problems.

A high assessment was given by both sides to the progressive development of Soviet-Vietnamese relations, which are being built upon the firm foundation of a bilateral treaty of friendship and cooperation. The heart of these relations is the close cooperation of the CPSU and the CPV based upon the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism.

During the discussion of international problems, mutual concern was expressed on the continuing international tension. In this connection, attention was drawn to the danger of the U.S. administration's policy which has the intention of breaking the military -- strategic balance that has formed in the world, of spreading the arms race into outer space, and of dictating its will to sovereign states.

During discussions on the southeast Asia situation, it was stressed that the hostile policies of the forces of imperialism and hegemonism with regard to Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia lies at the base of the continuing tension there, as well as the unending interference from the outside in the affairs of that region's countries. The Soviet People highly regard the common efforts of the SRV, Lao People's Democratic Republic, and the PRK in improving the Southeast Asia situation and in establishing an atmosphere of good-neighborliness, trust, and cooperation in that region.

The preliminary results of the talks that have taken place make it possible to conclude in general that the visit of the SRV party and government delegation will become an important new landmark in the strengthening and development of bonds of fraternal friendship, and comprehensive fruitful cooperation between the CPSU and the CPV and between the Soviet Union and Vietnam, in the interests of both countries' peoples, the socialist community, and for the cause of peace and progress.

In response to a question on whether the development of USSR-PRC relations of late had been discussed during the Soviet-Vietnamese talks, and whether concern had been expressed in this connection by the Vietnamese side, Vladimir Lomeyko said that the issue of Soviet-Chinese relations had been raised. Both sides, he noted, are convinced that the normalization of relations between the USSR and the PRC, and between the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the PRC will correspond to the aims of strengthening peace in Asia and international security. Interest was shown at the briefing for the Soviet Union and Vietnam's assessment of the nonaligned countries' proposal regarding the transformation of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace and the convocation of an international conference in this connection.

Answering this question, Vladimir Lomeyko said that the Soviet Union and Vietnam support the nonaligned countries' proposal regarding turning the Indian Ocean into a peace zone, as well as the UN General Assembly's 1971 declaration, which, in particular, envisages the liquidation of military bases in the Indian Ocean and the nondeployment of nuclear weapons there. Supporting this proposal, the Soviet Union and Vietnam constructively cooperate with the nonaligned countries in terms of realizing the most expeditious start of an international conference on the Indian Ocean. The USSR and the SRV are decisively coming out in favor of a completion of the UN special committee's preparatory work and the convocation of a conference in the first half of 1986, in accordance with the resolution of the 39th UN General Assembly session.

Le Duan Awards Tikhonov

BK290451 Hanoi VNA in English 1811 GMT 28 Jun 85

[Text] Hanoi VNA June 28 -- A ceremony was held in the Kremlin today to confer the Ho Chi Minh order, Vietnam's high honour, on Soviet party and state leaders in acknowledgement of their outstanding contributions to the enhancement of the fraternal friendship, militant solidarity and comprehensive cooperation between Vietnam and the Soviet Union.

Le Duan, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee, presented the Ho Chi Minh order to the recipients including N.A. Tikhonov, Political Bureau member of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Council of Ministers; V. V. Grishin, Political Bureau member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow party committee; B. N. Ponomaryov and V. I. Dolgikh, alternate members of the Political Bureau and secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee; and K. V. Rusakov, I. V. Kapitonov and M. V. Dimianin, secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee.

Present on the occasion were Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and G. A. Aliyev, V. I. Vorotnikov, A. A. Gromyko, E. K. Ligachov, N. I. Ryzhkov, M. S. Solomentsev, P. N. Demichev, V. V. Kuznetsov, S. L. Sokolov, V. P. Nikovnov and other high-ranking Soviet officials.

Members of the visiting Vietnamese delegation including Vo Chi Cong, To Huu, Tran Quynh, Vu Quang and Dinh Nho Liem were present.

Speaking at the ceremony, Le Duan extolled Soviet party and state leaders who were decorated with the Ho Chi Minh order as tireless fighters for the all-round development of the Soviet Union, for peace and friendship among nations, and close friends of the Vietnamese people. [sentence as received] He expressed deep thanks to those Soviet leaders who had together with the Soviet party and people given wholehearted support and assistance to the Vietnamese people in their revolutionary cause. He reiterated the Vietnamese party and peoples determination to further develop the great friendship between Vietnam and the Soviet Union.

On behalf of the recipients, N.A. Tikhonov thanked the Vietnamese party and government for the honour conferred on them and pledged to do their best for the futher consolidation and development of the friendship and all-round cooperation between the parties and peoples of the two countries.

Joint Declaration Signed

LD292002 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 29 Jun 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Le Duan signed a joint Soviet-Vietnamese declaration in the Kremlin on 28 June. Present at the signing were, on the Soviet side, Comrades Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Grishin, Gromyko, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Tikhonov, Demichev, Dolgikh, Kuznetsov, Ponomarev, Sokolov, Zimyanin, Kapitonov, Nikonov, Rusakov, and other officials; and on the Vietnamese side members of the SRV party and government delegation. The text of the joint Soviet-Vietnamese declaration will be published in the press. [video shows Gorbachev, and Le Duan seated at table signing documents; behind them can be seen a group of about 40 people. There is a close shot of Gorbachev seated at table; immediately behind him stand Tikhonov, Girshin, and Solomentsev in that order from left to right across the screen. A close shot of Le Duan signing is followed by a panning shot of Soviet leaders standing immediately behind the table, showing them in the following order as they appear left to right across the screen: Gromyko, Tikhonov, Grishin, Solomentsev, Ligachev, Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Ryzhkov, Ponomarev, Kuznetsov, Dolgikh, Demichev, Sokolov, Zimyanin, Kapitonov, Rusakov, and Nikonov. Gorbachev and Le Duan embrace.]

USSR-SRV Joint Declaration

PM291736 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 85 First Edition pp 1, 2

["Joint Soviet-Vietnamese Declaration" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] An SRV party-government delegation headed by Le Duan, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee, paid an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union 26 June through 1 July 1985 at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Soviet Government.

A cordial reception was given to fraternal Vietnam's emissaries in the Soviet Union and their meetings with party and state figures and representatives of the Soviet public were a vivid demonstration of the militant solidarity and inviolable friendship and cohesion between the CPSU and the CPV and between the peoples of the USSR and Vietnam.

During the visit talks were held between a Soviet party-government delegation headed by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the SRV party-government delegation headed by Le Duan, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee.

The following took part in the talks:

On the Soviet side -- M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; N.A. Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR foreign minister; N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; K.V. Rusakov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; N.V. Talyzin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and B.N. Chaplin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR ambassador to the SRV.

On the Vietnamese side -- Le Duan, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee; Vo Chi Cong, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPV Central Committee; To Huu, member of the CPV Central Committee and vice chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers; Tran Quynh, member of the CPV Central Committee and vice chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers; Vu Kuang, member of the CPV Central Committee and director of the CPV Central Committee Foreign Relations Department; and Dinh Nho Lien, member of the CPV Central Committee and SRV ambassador to the USSR.

A separate conversation was also held between M.S. Gorbachev and Le Duan.

The talks and conversations took place in a friendly, cordial atmosphere reflecting the fraternal nature of Soviet-Vietnamese relations and confirmed the complete unity of the sides' positions on all the questions discussed.

I. The Soviet and Vietnamese leaders exchanged information on progress in fulfilling the socioeconomic tasks set in the decisions of the congresses of the two fraternal parties and on the preparations that have begun in the Soviet Union and Vietnam for the 27th CPSU Congress and the 6th CPV Congress.

The Soviet side noted the great importance of the successes won by the Vietnamese people under the leadership of the CPV in the struggle for the motherland's independence and freedom and their achievements in socialist building. As the first country of socialism in Southeast Asia and a firm link of the socialist community, Vietnam is making an important contribution to the peoples' common struggle for peace, national independence, democracy, and social progress.

The representatives of fraternal Vietnam highly assessed the Soviet people's achievements in all spheres of economic building, the activity of the CPSU and the Soviet Government aimed at increasing the pace of the country's socioeconomic development, accelerating scientific and technical progress, increasing Soviet people's material well-being, and the USSR's efforts in the struggle for peace and the relaxation of international tension.

Having comprehensively analyzed the state of Soviet-Vietnamese relations, the leaders of the two countries expressed profound satisfaction with their steady upward development. The immutable foundation of these relations is the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between the Soviet Union and the SRV of 3 November 1978. Their core is the close cooperation between the CPSU and the CPV, which is based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism.

The sides will continue tirelessly to strengthen the bonds of close friendship and cohesion between the CPSU and the CPV. That is the principled and invariable line of the CPSU and the CPV and of the Soviet Union and Vietnam, a line reflecting the will and aspirations of the two countries' peoples.

Acting in the spirit of the relations of profound respect and complete trust prevailing between the two parties and countries, both sides will actively promote the further expansion of the exchange of experience of the parties' political, organizational, and ideological work and the strengthening of links between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the SRV national assembly and between the two countries' governments, ministries, and departments.

The delegations noted with satisfaction the steady expansion of Soviet-Vietnamese trade and economic cooperation, whose volume has more than doubled in the present 5-year plan compared with 1976-1980. Such high growth rates in trade and economic relations between the two countries have been possible thanks to their systematic development on the basis of the coordination of state plans and consultations on questions of economic policy.

The sides stated that the multifaceted Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation makes an important contribution to solving the socioeconomic tasks of the USSR and the SRV. Major projects in the power industry, coal industry, machine building, transportation and agricultural production have been or are being constructed in Vietnam, and these already enable the fraternal Vietnamese people to successfully resolve the most important national economic tasks.

The existence of great potential for the consistent expansion of this cooperation was pointed out. The main task at the present stage is to enhance the effectiveness of cooperation, improve the whole complex of bilateral economic links on a long-term, planned basis, further develop specialized production facilities, and implement mutually advantageous target programs.

In this connection the sides examined the progress in implementing the Long-Term Program for the Development of Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation between the Soviet Union and Vietnam. Satisfaction was expressed at the results achieved in this sphere, and practical measures to further implement the program were agreed on.

The Soviet Union, guided by Leninist principles of socialist internationalism, mindful of Vietnam's urgent needs, and with a view to accelerating the development of leading sectors of industry and agriculture, strengthening the country's defenses, and increasing the population's well-being, has decided to increase economic assistance to the SRV, to grant it a new credit on preferential terms in 1986-1990, and also to defer repayments on earlier credits. Deliveries to Vietnam of goods important to the national economy such as petroleum products, fertilizers, rolled metals, and cotton will be increased.

The two sides agreed to direct efforts toward planning and constructing projects of great importance to Vietnam's economy and the development of the country's export base. These include the acceleration of work to locate and extract oil and gas on the continental shelf of southern Vietnam and the creation on the basis of the country's domestic oil and gas resources of petroleum refining and petrochemical industry projects and of a plant to produce nitrogen fertilizers, and also power industry projects, in accordance with the general scheme for the development of this sector, and a number of machine building enterprises, the reconstruction of railroads and the increase of their traffic capacity, the completion of the feasibility study for the construction of a metallurgical combine, and the start of the construction of a metallurgical converter plant with a capacity of about 500,000 metric tons of steel per year as the first phase of this combine.

The Vietnamese side will ensure the development in every possible way of the production of output in which the Soviet side is interested, primarily natural rubber, vegetables and fruits; certain industrial crops; and light and local industry products manufactured from Vietnamese and customer-supplied raw materials, in order to increase exports of these items to the Soviet Union. The Vietnamese side will make the greatest possible efforts to successfully fulfill its commitments for the delivery of goods to the USSR in accordance with the bilateral agreements that have been concluded. This will help to make Soviet-Vietnamese economic relations more mutually advantageous and more balanced.

In trade relations between the two countries the Soviet Union will grant Vietnam terms in accordance with the spirit of the decision of the CEMA countries' economic summit conference.

The desire was expressed on both sides to continue to take an active part in developing the international socialist division of labor in accordance with the decisions of the CEMA countries' economic summit conference. The delegations noted the great importance of the declaration of the conference of secretaries of the fraternal parties' central committees for economic questions regarding the readiness of the socialist community countries to continue to fulfill their international duty of assisting the SRV in the faster development of its national economy and of the decisions of the 40th sitting of the CEMA session, which has just been held in Warsaw.

It was stated on the Soviet side that the USSR will continue to strengthen international solidarity with the heroic Vietnamese people, who are building socialism, and to give fraternal Vietnam every possible support and assistance.

The SRV party-government delegation expressed profound gratitude to the CPSU and the Soviet Government and to the entire Soviet people for their great and effective assistance in the building and defense of the motherland and emphasized that the consolidation of friendship and cohesion with the Soviet Union in every possible way is the invariable strategic course of the CPV and the SRV.

II. During the exchange of opinions on topical questions of the international situation and of the world communist, workers, and national liberation movement, the sides noted the high level of collaboration between the Soviet Union and the SRV in the foreign policy sphere and advocated the further close coordination of the two countries' efforts in the interests of peace and socialism.

The Soviet and Vietnamese delegations expressed a united assessment of the present complex international situation and pointed to the danger of the policy of reactionary imperialist circles, headed by the United States, which have decided to smash the prevailing strategic military equilibrium in the world and to extend the arms race to space, and who are trying to dictate their will to sovereign states, and are crudely interfering in their internal affairs. There is now no more important and urgent task than to prevent the world from sliding toward nuclear disaster and to preserve peace on earth.

The two sides stressed that the unity and cohesion of the socialist community and the expansion of collaboration among all forces sincerely interested in preserving and consolidating peace are assuming special significance in the prevailing international situation.

The recent meeting of the Warsaw Pact countries' top party and state figures, at which the protocol on extending the term of the pact was signed, was a major political event of our time.

The Warsaw Pact organization reliably guards the gains of socialism and the peaceful labor of the socialist countries' peoples and promotes the development and strengthening of their cohesion and comprehensive cooperation. It plays a decisive role in preserving peace on the European Continent and throughout the world.

Both sides stressed the large-scale and constructive nature of the socialist states' initiatives, including those regarding the adoption by all the nuclear powers, following the USSR's example, of a commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, the freezing of nuclear potentials, the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, and the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace between the Warsaw Pact states and the NATO countries and between all participants in the all-European conference.

The Vietnamese side expressed total support for the Soviet Union's principled positi at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva and expressed the conviction that the United States' joining in the moratorium that the USSR has declared for the entire duration of the Geneva talks on the creation, including scientific research work, testing, and deployment of offensive space armaments would be of great importance for the success of these talks.

The historic importance was pointed out of the 40th anniversary of vic ry over Hitlerite fascism and Japanese militarism, which all progressive forces n the planet are marking by accelerating the struggle to end the arms race, remove th threat of war, and improve the international situation.

A detailed exchange of opinions took place on questions of the situation in Asia and the Pacific. The sides resolutely condemned the aggressive U.S. policy in various parts of this region and Washington's plans to turn the region into yet another arena of military-political confrontation with the socialist countries and noted the danger of the buildup of military preparations by the United States and its allies in the Far East and of their efforts to remilitarize Japan and to expedite the creation of a Washington-Tokyo-Seoul militarist alliance.

Both sides reaffirmed their commitment to the idea of transforming Asia into a zone of peace and equal cooperation and advocated accelerating the quest for constructive and mutually acceptable ways to solve the problems of ensuring peace and security on the continent. These aims, the sides are convinced, can be achieved through the united efforts of all Asian states on the basis of a comprehensive approach, via bilateral and multilateral talks and exchanges of opinions. The achievement of these aims would be effectively promoted by implementation of the socialist states' well-known proposals, including those on implementing confidence-building measures in the Far East, concluding a convention on mutual nonaggression and the nonuse of force in relations between Asian and Pacific states, and transforming the Indian Ocean into a peace zone and convening an international conference on this question no later than the first half of 1986, as determined by the 39th UN General Assembly session. In the sides' opinion, the holding in the future of an all-Asian forum in order to examine the whole complex of questions relating to ensuring security on the continent would be of great significance.

In discussing questions of the situation in Southeast Asia, the delegations stressed that what lies at the bottom of persisting tension in the region is the hostile policy of imperialist and hegemonist forces toward Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia and the unceasing external interference in the affairs of the region's countries.

The Soviet Union resolutely supports the struggle of the Indochina states to thwart the intrigues of these forces and defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The Soviet side also expressed complete support for the constructive course and practical steps of the SRV, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and PRK to improve the situation in Southeast Asia and establish an atmosphere of good-neighborliness, trust, and cooperation in the region. The USSR welcomes efforts in this direction by all Southeast Asian countries.

The USSR party-government delegation reaffirmed the Soviet Union's invariable solidarity with the efforts of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia to further strengthen their cohesion, which is an essential condition of victories by the peoples of the three fraternal Indochina countries in the struggle to build socialism and defend their revolutionary gains and is an important factor in strengthening peace in Southeast Asia.

The Soviet Union and Vietnam stated their solidarity with the people of the LPDR, who are traveling the path of building socialism and are defending their country's sovereignty and territorial integrity against encroachments from outside.

The sides expressed support for the selfless efforts of the PRK's working people in building a new society and repelling the intrigues of external reactionary forces.

The USSR and the SRV stated their support for the DPRK's efforts and initiatives aimed at consolidating peace and stability on the Korean peninsula and peacefully uniting the country.

In the sides' opinion, the aims of strengthening peace in Asia and international security would be served by the normalization of the relations of the Soviet Union and the SRV with the PRC.

The sides noted that the preservation of dangerous hotbeds of tension in the Near and Middle East, Asia, Africa, and Central America is a direct consequence of the policy of interference in the liberated countries' affairs pursued by militarist imperialist circles, especially in the United States. Resolutely advocating the elimination of these hotbeds of tension and the peaceful settlement of the existing conflicts, the sides declared that these aims would be served by the adoption by every permanent member of the UN Security Council of a pledge to strictly observe the principles of noninterference and the nonuse of force or the threat of force in relations with states on all continents and not to involve them in military blocs.

The Soviet Union and Vietnam noted the increasing role of the Nonaligned Movement in the struggle for peace, against the arms race, and for the restructuring of international econimic relations on a just and democratic basis. The sides greatly appreciate India's important contribution to the struggle to strengthen peace and security, remove the threat of nuclear war, and bring about the relaxation of international tension and that country's constructive role in consolidating the unity and enhancing the prestige of the Nonaligned Movement in world affairs.

III. Expressing profound satisfaction with the results of the talks, the USSR and SRV party-government delegations expressed the conviction that this visit will certainly be an important new landmark in the strengthening and development of the bonds of fraternal friendship and comprehensive fruitful cooperation between the CPSU and the CPV and between the Soviet Union and the SRV in the interests of the Soviet and Vietnamese peoples, the socialist community, and the cause of peace and progress.

The SRV party-government delegation expressed profound gratitude for the friendly, cordial reception extended to it during its stay in the Soviet Union.

The Vietnamese side invited a Soviet party-government delegation headed by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to pay an official friendly visit to the SRV. The invitation was accepted with thanks.

M. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

Le Duan, general secretary of the CPV

Le Duan 29 June Activities

LD292148 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 29 Jun 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today the SRV party-government delegation with Comrade Le Duan at its head, visited the Moscow machine-tool building works named after Sergo Ordzhonikidze. The works collective received the Vietnamese comrades in a cordial, fraternal way. The visitors inspected the workshops of the enterprise and took an interest in its reconstruction and progress in fulfilling the tasks for the year and for the 5-year plan period as a whole.

At a meeting between the delegation and the party and economic aktiv and the workers of the works, Le Duan told those present about Vietnam's achievements in different spheres of life. He stressed that thanks to the high level of patriotism and selfless creative labor, with the assistance of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community the Vietnamese people are successfully building a socialist society and making its contribution to the development of the national liberation movement and to the cause of strengthening peace upon the planet. Our meeting with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev confirmed the unity of the views of our parties and governments on the issues under discussion, Le Duan said. The talks between the party and government delegations of Vietnam and the Soviet Union were successful, too.

Le Duan Lays Wreath

LD292304 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 29 Jun 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Le Duan and members of the SRV party-government delegation, who are in our country on an official friendly visit, today visited the Lenin Mausoleum and laid a wreath. The guests honored with a minute of silence the memory of the creator of the CPSU and founder of the world's first socialist state.

The emissaries of the fraternal country paid a tribute of profound respect to the Soviet fighting men who fell in the struggle against fascism for the sake of world peace. They laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at the Kremlin Wall.

The Vietnamese guests were accompanied by Comrade Rusakov and other officials.

Lays Foundation Stone

LD292227 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 29 Jun 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A meeting of Soviet-Vietnamese friendship, devoted to the laying of the foundation stone of a monument to Ho Chi Minh, the outstanding figure of the Vietnamese and international communist and workers' movement, has taken place in Moscow.

The monument will be erected on the square which bears his name, and will be a tribute of respect for the memory of this great son of the Vietnamese people, fighter and internationalist and great friend of the Soviet Union. Those present greeted Comrade Le Duan and the members of the Vietnamese party and government delegation. Present at the meeting were Comrades Grishin, Rusakov and Comrade Talyzin, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

The meeting was opened by Comrade Grishin:

[Begin Grishin recording] A whole period in the life of Ho Chi Minh is linked with our capital. It was here that he mastered Leninism, studied with persistence, and developed as a figure of the Marxist-Leninist type and taught his comrades in struggle. Within the walls of the communist university of the working people of the East and with the involvement of Ho Chi Minh, a detachment of Vietnamese Communists was trained who have made an outstanding contribution to the development of the revolutionary movement in the countries of Indochina. Soon the working people of Vietnam and their friends throughout the world will be celebrating the 40th anniversary of the victory of the Vietnamese revolution and the birth of the first state of workers and peasants in Southeast Asia. The CPSU and the Soviet people have, from the first days of the Vietnamese revolution, stood firmly upon the side of the just cause of the working people of Vietnam. The memory of Ho Chi Minh will live forever in the hearts of Soviet people, as the inviolable friendship between our fraternal parties, countries and peoples, lives and gains in strength. [applause] [end recording]

The cover was removed from the foundation stone. The state hymns of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the Soviet Union were played.

[Begin Le Duan recording in Vietnamese with superimposed Russian translation] Continuing the cause of President Ho Chi Minh, the communists and the entire Vietnamese people view the strengthening and development of Soviet-Vietnamese friendship as their sacred duty. This friendship corresponds to the interests of the peoples of our countries, to the triumph of socialism, national independence and peace. We sincerely rejoice in the enormous successes that have been achieved by the fraternal Soviet people under the leadership of the glorious Communist Party of the Soviet Union in creative labor in the name of the prosperity of the country and the happiness of all peoples of the planet. The monument to Vladimir Ilich Lenin in Hanoi, the construction of which will be completed in the very near future, and the monument to Ho Chi Minh in Moscow will draw our peoples even closer together and will always remind us of the need to strengthen solidarity upon the basis of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism. [end recording]

Comrade Fedyunin, leader of a team of drivers at the No 29 Motor-Transport Combine and Comrade Solovyeva, a student at the No 2 Moscow Medical Institute, who spoke at the meeting, stressed that the further strengthening of the bonds of friendship and fraternal cooperation between the two countries corresponds to the cause of peace and socialism. The meeting was declared closed. The internationale sounded in the square. Flowers were laid at the place where the foundation stone of the monument was laid.

Departs for Volgograd

LD291429 Moscow TASS in English 1413 GMT 29 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS -- A Soviet-Vietnamese friendship rally has been held in Ho Chi Minh Square in Moscow today. It was devoted to laying the foundation stone for a monument to Ho Chi Minh, an outstanding figure of the Vietnamese and international communist and working class movement. The participants in the rally warmly welcomed Le Duan, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam, members of the SRV party and government delegation, who are currently on an official friendly visit in the USSR.

Since the very first days of the Vietnamese revolution, the CPSU and the entire Soviet people have firmly sided with the just cause of the working people of Vietnam. Both in the years of peace and in the years of imperialist aggression the Soviet Union rendered all-round assistance to Vietnam, said Viktor Grishin, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU, first secretary of the Moscow Party City Committee, addressing the rally. Soviet-Vietnamese friendship and fraternal internationalism have spectacularly stood the test of time over the past 40 years.

The victory of the Vietnamese people and the creation of united Socialist Vietnam have created a qualitatively new situation in South East Asia, opened the way to peace, stability and goodneighbourliness in that part of the world, Grishin pointed out.

Our people highly values the friendly sentiments of the Vietnamese people, the good relations that have formed between our countries, he stressed. In the present-day troubled world that the imperialists are starting a new spiral of the arms race in an attempt to push humankind into the abyss of a nuclear catastrophe, coordinated actions of the forces of socialism, peace and progress assume special significance. Our strength lies in unity. We will be ableto put up by joint efforts a strong barrier in the way of those who would like to turn the peoples into their nuclear hostages, force their will on them.

Carrying on the cause of President Ho Chin Minh, the Communists and the Communists and the entire Vietnamese people invariably regard it to be their sacred duty to strengthen and develop Soviet-Vietnamese friendship, Le Duan told the meeting. This friendship accords with the interests of the peoples of ourcountries, the triumph of socialism, national independence and peace. We sincerely rejoice at tremendous successes scored by the fraternal Soviet people under the leadership of the glorious CPSU in the creative effort, in the name of the country's prosperity and happiness of other peoples of the world.

The Vietnamese people relying for support on the enormous, sincere and valuable aid from the Soviet Union devotes all of its energies to building socialism and to the defence of the homeland, is making a contribution to the joint struggle of the peoples for peace, for the noble goals of our epoch, he pointed out.

The monument to Lenin in Hanoi, whose construction is to be completed soon, and the monument to Ho Chi Minh in Moscow will bring our peoples even closer together, Le Duan continued, will always remind us about the need to strengthen solidarity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and social internationalism, inspire to making fresh advance on the way of building a bright future, a wonderful life for the present and future generations. [sentence as received]

Tonight the party and government delegation of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam left Moscow for Volgograd.

Returns to Moscow

LD301648 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 30 Jun 85

[Text] The SRV party and state delegation acquainted itself today with the hero city on the Volga. Showing their respect toward the city's defenders, the guests placed a wreath at the eternal flame at the square of the fallen fighters, which burns at the foot of the obelisk to the heroes of Red Tsaritsyn [prerevolutionary name of Volgograd] and the battle of Stalingrad. The delegation made a tour of historic sites of the fierce fighting in defense of the city, and visited the Heroes' Walk where memorials have been erected in honor of more than 300 heroes of the Soviet Union who were awarded the title during the great battle on the Volga, fellow Volgograders, and holders of the three orders of glory, the embankment named after the legendary 26th Army which defended the city here, and Pavlov's house. The guests observed the monument-ensemble to the heroes of the battle of Stalingrad at the Mamayev Kurgan and laid flowers in the Hall of Soldier's Glory. They also acquainted themselves with the museum panorama of the battle of Stalingrad and visited the Volga GES named after the 22th Congress of the CPSU. In the evening, the guests left for Moscow.

Calls on SRV Embassy

BK010344 Hanoi Domestic Service in Vietnamese 1430 GMT 30 Jun 85

[Text] On the morning [as heard] of 30 June, Comrade Le Duan, general secretary of the CPV General Committee, who is heading our party and government delegation on an official friendship visit to the Soviet Union, called on our embassy in the Soviet Union. All the cadres and employees of our embassy and many representatives of Vietnamese cadres working or undergoing training in the Soviet Union, students, research students, vocational students, and workers in the Soviet Union gave the comrade general secretary a very enthusiastic welcome and attentively listened to his cordial talk and instructions.

Comrade Le Duan deeply analyzed the situation of our country and its position in the international arena, the orientations for socioeconomic development in our country, and the issues that must be resolved to gradually stabilize and improve the people's living standard and build the material bases of socialism. The comrade general secretary urged all present to develop the spirit of collective mastery, enhance revolutionary ethics, improve their knowledge of advanced science and technology and strive hard in their work and study so as to contribute to the country's revolutionary cause.

On behalf of all present, Ambassador Dinh Nho Liem expressed pleasure to see that the general secretary is in good health, and pledged to scrupulously carry out his instructions, make efforts in work and study, and enhance their revolutionary ethics with the aim of contributing to the cause of national construction and defense and to the strengthening of the great friendship and comprehensive cooperation between Vietnam and the Soviet Union. The ambassador wished the comrade general secretary good health always so he, together with the party Central Committee, will lead our people to new achievements in furtherance of our country's extremely glorious revolutionary undertaking.

Farewell Ceremony

LD011207 Moscow TASS in English 1150 GMT 1 Jul 85

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS -- The party and government delegation of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, headed by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam Le Duan, that was staying in the USSR on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Council of Ministers of the USSR, was seen off at a ceremony held in the Kremlin today in the Georgiyevskiy Hall of the Grand Kremlin Palace.

The General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and other officials said a warm goodbye to Le Duan and members of the delegation.

BAYBAKOV MEETS WITH POLAND'S JARUZELSKI, GORYWODA

LD300320 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1843 GMT 29 Jun 85

[Text] Warsaw 29 June (TASS) -- W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish People's Republic Council of Ministers, received N.K. Baybakov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosplan, who is here on a visit.

In the course of their conversation the successful development of all-around cooperation between the USSR and the Polish People's Republic on the basis of decisions of the economic summit conference of CEMA member-states and on the basis of the long-term program for the development of economic and scientific-technical cooperation between the USSR and the Polish People's Republic for the period up to the year 2000 was stressed. It was noted that the results of the 40th meeting of the CEMA session, which has taken place in Warsaw, will serve the development of socialist economic integration and the raising of cooperation between the two countries to a higher level.

The course of work on the coordination of the national economic plans of the USSR and the Polish People's Republic for the period 1986-90 was examined. It was pointed out that the coordination of the plans must assist the widening of specialization and cooperation of production, the acceleration of the introduction of the achievements of scientific and technical progress, the growth of the efficiency of management.

Negotiations also took place between N.K. Baybakov and M. Gorywoda, deputy chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers and chairman of the Planning Commission attached to the Polish Council of Ministers.

HUNGARIAN ASSEMBLY REELECTS LOSONCZI, LAZAR, SARLOS

LD281824 Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT 28 Jun 85

[Text] Budapest June 28 TASS -- The new National Assembly of Hungary had its first sitting in Budapest today. It was attended by Janos Kadar, general secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' party, other party and state leaders of Hungary. The deputies elected the Presidential Council of the Hungarian People's Republic, the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People's Republic, a number of other organs of state authority. Pal Losonczi became president of the Presidential Council of Hungary, Gyorgy Lazar chairman of the Council of Ministers. Istvan Sarlos was elected chairman of the National Assembly of Hungary.

BULGARIAN CP DELEGATION VISITS USSR 10-14 JUNE

PM261031 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 85 Second Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Familiarization With Experience"]

[Text] In accordance with the plan for interparty links between the CPSU and the BCP, a delegation of BCP party workers led by A. Konstantinov, candidate member of the BCP Central Committee and deputy chief of the BCP Central Committee Organizational Department, was in the Soviet Union from 10-14 June.

The Bulgarian comrades familiarized themselves with the CPSU's experience in improving the style and methods of party orgainzational work. They had meetings and conversations at the CPSU Central Committee Organizational Party Work Department, the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, Moscow CPSU Obkom, party gorkoms and raykoms, and Estonian SSR and Moscow Oblast party organizations.

ROMANOV OUT; SHEVARDNADZE FULL POLITBURO MEMBER

LD011044 Moscow TASS in English 1040 GMT 1 Jul 85

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS -- The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union held its regular plenary meeting on July 1, 1985.

The plenum examined questions of the third session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of the 11th Convocation. General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev delivered a speech on these questions at the plenum.

The plenum stressed the need for persistent perfection of the activity of soviets of peoples' deputies, exact implementation of its functions by each link of the political system of our society, further enhancement of the leading role of the party, consolidation of its influence on all sectors of state, economic and social and cultural construction.

The plenum of the CPSU Central Committee examined organizational issues. G.V. Romanov's request to relieve him of the duties of member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in connection with retirement on health grounds was satisfied. The plenum made alternate member E. A. Shevardnadze a full member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and elected B. N. Yeltsin and L. N. Zaykov secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee. The plenum of the CPSU Central Committee ended its work.

POLITBURO DISCUSSES NEW PROGRAM, SYRIANS' VISIT

LD291726 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 29 Jun 85

["At the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS -- The Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU discussed at its regular meeting the course of preparation of a new wording of the programme of the CPSU. It was pointed out that the new wording of the party programme would become the most important document of the 27th Congress of the CPSU accumulating the experience of the party, giving a Marxist-Leninist analysis of new phenomena of home and international life, illuminating the ways of struggle for lasting peace and social progress. It is necessary to reflect in it the characteristic features of the present-day stage in the development of the Soviet society, the aims and objectives of the party of a qualitative transformation of all aspects of social life.

It was stressed that the programme guidelines should be realistic, precisely weighed and closely dovetailed with the plans of the country's economic and social development for a long term.

Questions pertaining to accelerating the socio-economic development of the society, intensifying the economy on the basis of scientific-technical progress, perfecting the whole system of social relations, making fresh advances in the country's march towards communism are to be central to it. The new wording of the programme of the CPSU should reveal in an even larger measure the regularities of strengthening the party's guiding role in the Soviet society, strengthening the links of the party with the masses, undeviating observance of the Leninist principles and norms of party life.

The Political Bureau has approved the appointment of Mikhail Gorbachev as chairman of the commission for preparing a draft of a new wording and outlined the order of further work on the draft.

The Political Bureau examined and approved of the results of the talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and other Soviet leaders with the Syrian delegation led by President Hafiz al-Asad. The high level and diverse character of the lasting friendly relations between the USSR and the Syrian Arab Republic, the good prospects for their further development, closeness or concurrence of the stands of both sides on many key issues of the present-day international situation were pointed out with satisfaction. The importance was stressed of the fact that, as the talks held have born out, Syria consistently adheres to the anti-imperialist positions and declares for a comprehensive and just Middle East settlement, against the policy of separate deals pursued by the United States and Israel, which is hostile to the interests of the Arabs.

At its meeting the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU examined and passed decisions on some issues of party and state construction.

SUPREME SOVIET SESSION SCHEDULED FOR 2 JULY

LD300120 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2230 GMT 29 Jun 85

[Text] The third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Eleventh Convocation will open in the Great Kremlin Palace on 2 July at 1000 hours with the joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities.

A session of the Council of Elders of the Soviet of the Union and of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet will take place in the Hall of Sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Great Kremlin Palace on the eve of the opening of the session, on 1 July at 1730 hours.

Registration of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies, arriving to take part in the session, will begin at 1000 hours and end at 1900 hours in the Kremlin, in the building of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

GORBACHEV GREETS OPENING OF MOSCOW FILM FESTIVAL

LD261517 Moscow TASS in English 1506 GMT 28 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, sent a cordial greeting to the participants and guests of the 14th Moscow International Film Festival which opened in the Societ capital today.

"In the present-day world mankind is in special need of mutual understanding and trust, in effective cultural communication," he said in his message. "It is very important that the people on earth be able to overpower the complex problems of the times, first of all the main of them -- the danger of nuclear catastrophe."

"The 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism has reminded all once again of the need sacredly to protect the peace that has been won at the cost of millions of lives. It is our firm belief that international security can be ensured only by collective efforts. Our ideal is a world without wars, a world without weapons."

"A true artist," Mikhail Gorbachev siad, "may not stay aside from the pressing tasks of the times. By his creative work he always serves the good and the light. An honest and bold cinema keenly reacting to the concerns and worries of the time can do much to promote social progress, national independence and international cooperation."

LEADERS ATTEND UN ANNIVERSARY RECEPTION

LD261905 Moscow TASS in English 1829 GMT 26 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS -- The commission for observing in the USSR the United Nations Year and the International Peace Year held a reception in Moscow on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter.

Present at the reception were members of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, First Deputy Chariman of the USSR Council of Ministers, USSR Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko, Chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet Avgust Voss, heads of a number of ministries and departments of the USSR, foreign ministers of union republics, high executives of the CPSU Central Committee and the Moscow City Committee of the CPSU, of ministries and departments, leaders of public organizations. Heads of the diplomatic representations accredited in the Soviet Union, Soviet and foreign jounalists were among the guests.

UKRAINE CP LEADERS DISCUSS SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS

AU251323 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAINA in Ukrainian 19 Jun 85 p 1

[RATAU report: "Let Us Increase Our Contribution Toward Accelerating Scientific-Technical Progress -- A Conference in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] On 18 June the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee held a conference that was attended by Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo members and candidate members, deputy chairmen of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers, party organization leaders and secretaries in the Ukrainian Gosplan, in ministries and departments, the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, and the southern branch of the All-Union Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences, and responsible workers of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. The conference examined the tasks for organizing the implementation of the directives set forth at the 11-12 June conference held in the CPSU Central Committee on problems concerning the acceleration of scientific-technical progress.

It was noted that the conference in the CPSU Central Committee and the report delivered to it by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, gave a great impulse to exactingness in analyzing the state of affairs in each national economic branch, each oblast, city, and rayon, and to the intensive work to improve the economic mechanism. What matters now is to clearly organize practical work to find and utilize reserves for accelerating scientific-technical progress. The Ukrainian Gosplan, Academy of Sciences, ministries, and departments are expected to draw up concrete measures encompassing the entire complex of problems -- economic, organization, and social ones, those concerning the development of culture and education, and the activity of all sectors of the national economy and management. Concrete reserves and the results of their utilization should be taken into account in the draft national economic plans for the 12th 5-year period beginning in 1986.

Similar work is to be carried out by party obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms. It is particularly important to organize this work in a businesslike way in the field and in every labor collective. To render assistance and to organize work directly at enterprises, projects, production associations, and scientific research institutes, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, Council of Ministers, Gosplan, ministries, and departments will send their responsible functionaries to a number of cities.

A great role in implementing the party directives for accelerating scientific-technical progress, it was stated at the conference, lies with the ministerial and departmental apparatus, as well as party committees. They are expected to foster initiative and become authentic guides in the pursuit of scientific-technical policy, the organizers of new actions in accomplishing tasks for production intensification. The conference also discussed the intensification of scientific research and the concentration of the efforts of scientific, planning, and designing collectives in accomplishing the most important national economic tasks.

It was emphasized at the conference that accelerated socioeconomic development on the basis of scientific-technical progress is a pressing matter of party and nationwide importance. It requires the further fostering of discipline, and raising the responsibility of every leader and worker, every communist and every Soviet man.

Comrade V.V. Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, addressed the conference.

Participating in the discussion were: Academician B. Ye. Paton, president of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences; V.A. Masol, Ukrainian Council of Ministers deputy chairman and Gosplan chairman; S.I. Gurenko, Ukrainian Council of Ministers deputy chairman; V.F. Sklyarov, Ukrainian minister of power and electrification; and B.V. Sakunov, party committee secretary in the Ukrainian Ministry of Construction of Heavy Industry Enterprises.

DOLGIKH ADDRESSES MEDIA GROUP ON FUEL SUPPLIES

LD271319 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 27 Jun 85

[Text] A conference of leaders of mass information media was held at the CPSU Central Committee today. It discussed the tasks of news and propaganda on preparing the national economy for work in autumn and winter conditions. A report was delivered at the conference by Comrade Dolgikh, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Attention was drawn to the need for deep and systematic exposure in the press and on television and radio of the many-sided actions of party organizations and labor collectives in putting into effect the decision of the CPSU Central Committee on supplying the national economy and the population with fuel and electrical and thermal energy in the autumn and winter period of 1985-86, and on ensuring fulfillment of the plans for fuel extraction and the creation of the necessary reserves of fuel at power stations and enterprises. Stress was laid on the important role of the mass media in mobilizing the working people for stepping up the transportation of fuel and raw materials by rail, speeding up the repairs of energy capacities, preparing housing and municipal services for the autumn and winter period, and intensifying work on saving fuel and energy in industry and in everyday life.